JANUARY 1936

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

URGENT PROBLEMS FACING THE GERMAN C. P.
BY ERCOLI

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN
3 ARTICLES

THERE ARE NO GROUNDS FOR SELF-SATISFACTION
BY KUUSINEN

REVIEW OF THE DAILY WORKER

NUMBER 1

PRICE 15 CENTS

Build the United People's Front

By EARL BROWDER

This pamphlet, containing the report to the November Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, constitutes the main materials for the pre-convention discussion in the period preceding the Ninth National Convention. In this report, Comrade Browder sums up our recent experiences and achievements, and sets forth our tasks in the light of the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the C. I.

72 Pages—10 Cents

Read Also of the Experience of the French Workers

THE PEOPLE'S FRONT IN FRANCE, *by Marcel Cachin, Maurice Thorez and Andre Marty* 10

●

Other New Pamphlets

THE TOWNSEND MOVEMENT—WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT ISN'T, *by Alex Bittelman* 05

UNITED WE STAND—For Peace and Socialism, *by Gil Green* 05

Report on the Sixth World Congress of the Young Communist International.

THE MENACE OF A NEW WORLD WAR 05

A HANDBOOK FOR PROJECT WORKERS, *by Herbert Benjamin* 05

●

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D **New York City**

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published every month in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese and Spanish.

Vol. XIII JANUARY, 1936 No. 1

CONTENTS

DIMITROFF'S VICTORY AT LEIPZIG WAS A BLOW AT THAELMANN'S JAILERS 3

TEACH THE MASSES—LEARN FROM THE MASSES 10

THERE ARE NO GROUNDS FOR SELF-SATISFACTION 18
By O. KUUSINEN

URGENT PROBLEMS FACING THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY 33
By M. ERCOLI

YOU CANNOT SIT BETWEEN TWO STOOLS 47
By K. GOTTWALD

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN 53
By HARRY POLLITT

THE MAIDEN SPEECH OF WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P. 67

FROM THE LETTER OF AN ENGLISH COMRADE ON THE GENERAL ELECTIONS 73

THE STALINIST SCHOOL OF REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE FOR THE VICTORY OF BOLSHEVISM 77

DOCUMENTS

GREETINGS TO COMRADE DIMITROFF FROM THE FOURTH CONFERENCE OF THE C.P. OF GERMANY 84

THE EXPULSION OF TORGLER FROM THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY 85

THE BEHAVIOR OF COMRADES TANEV AND POPOV AT THE LEIPZIG TRIAL 86

OUR BEHAVIOR AT THE LEIPZIG TRIAL 88
Declaration by B. POPOV AND V. TANEV

DECISION OF THE C.C. OF THE C.P. OF BULGARIA ON THE DECLARATION OF COMRADES POPOV AND TANEV 90

REVIEWS

REVIEW OF THE "DAILY WORKER" (U.S.) FOR OCTOBER, 1935 . . 93
By R.

ENGLAND, ITALY, ETHIOPIA 101
By RICHARD

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, $1.75; six months, $.90; single copies, 15 cents.

Announcement

The Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the Editorial Board of the journal, *The Communist International*, have decided to enlarge the size of the journal and issue it as a monthly instead of a bi-monthly magazine as previously.

Now, more than ever before, it is urgent that every reader does his share to spread the journal to ever wider circles.

EDITORIAL BOARD OF

The Communist International.

Dimitroff's Victory at Leipzig Was a Blow at Thaelmann's Jailers

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEIPZIG TRIAL

EXACTLY two years ago the Leipzig trial, which struck the first severe blow at German fascism, came to an end.

Two worlds came into conflict in the fascist court. The world of exploitation and oppression, decayed and condemned by history to the scrapheap, came face to face with the new world, the world of socialism. The duel between Dimitroff and Goering not only revealed the immeasurable superiority of the Communist revolutionary over the representative of frantic, fascist reaction, but symbolized the struggle which is going on between two worlds.

German fascism staged the Leipzig trial in order to portray the Communist Party of Germany and the Comintern, by means of foul forgeries and stool-pigeon evidence, as a band of international brigands, and to credit itself with the role of the savior of Europe from the "Communist incendiaries". By means of this trial, fascism wanted above all to justify its bloody dungeons, its bestial terror, and the annihilation of the best people of the German working class, in the eyes of the whole world. When Dimitroff was arrested, in the first days of March 1933, the fascists had already tortured tens of thousands of the best working class fighters in prisons, concentration camps and the Storm Troop barracks. Ernst Thaelmann, the leader of the German working class, had been captured by the enemy. Thaelmann was in prison. But the Bolshevik cadres which had grown up and become steeled under his leadership continued their heroic struggle against the fascist dictatorship, in spite of the difficult conditions of illegal existence under the fascist regime.

However, the course taken by the Leipzig trial, and its outcome deeply alarmed the fascist rulers. Georgi Dimitroff, Bulgarian Communist, and member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, brought into the court room as prisoner and defendant, acted as a passionate, relentless prosecutor against fascism.

Dimitroff's first speech at the trial compelled the whole world to follow the passionate struggle of this indomitable Bolshevik with ever growing tension. The world sensed in it the strength of communism, the strength of the Stalinist guard. A Bolshevik stood before the bloody fascist tribunal, fighting as Lenin and Stalin have taught us to fight. Dimitroff put German fascism in the prisoners' dock. Dimitroff's behavior at the trial not only revealed fascism in its true colors, but brought tens of thousands of the German workers to their right senses again, imparted to them again a sense of their class dignity, and inspired them with confidence in the victory of the proletarian revolution. Not

only the German Communists, but the Social-Democratic workers as well, saw in Dimitroff the embodiment of their class power, their great tribune.

The Leipzig trial will go down in the history of the emancipation struggle of the working class as an event which signified that the working class of Europe had made a turn in its resistance to fascism. By his action in the court, Georgi Dimitroff, the hero of the Leipzig trial, widely unfurled the banner of joint struggle against fascism by the masses of the working class. The Leipzig trial gave a decisive stimulus to the establishment of the international working class united front.

Dimitroff's words addressed in court to Goering: "You fear my questions, Mr. Prime Minister?!" and the reply of the enraged Goering, demonstrated to the whole world that the fascist victors are in mortal fear of the gigantic power of the proletariat.

The battle won by Dimitroff in Leipzig in effect smashed the indictment against Thaelmann. Dimitroff brilliantly proved the fact that the Communist Party of Germany in the beginning of 1933 did not at all consider its direct task to be the organization of an armed uprising, and that the Communist Party categorically condemns acts of individual terror as a method of struggle.

When Dimitroff arrived in Moscow, Comrade Manuilsky wrote the following:

> *"Dimitroff brilliantly defended the German Communist Party against fascist fabrications. It was impossible not to acquit him. But his acquittal is a blow at the indictment against Thaelmann. That is why the workers of all countries responded to the news of the release of Dimitroff with the demand of 'Release Thaelmann!'"*

For almost three years Thaelmann has been incarcerated in prison. For almost three years the fascists have been concocting material for the indictment, but up to now they have not even published the indictment. At Leipzig Dimitroff destroyed the foundation of the indictment against Thaelmann.

And now, two years after Leipzig, the proletariat of the whole world must demand the release of Thaelmann still more persistently, and with still more force than before. Two years ago the workers of all countries raised their voices in defense of Dimitroff. For millions of Communist and Social-Democratic workers Dimitroff became the banner of active joint struggle against fascism. The Leipzig trial gave a decisive impetus to the united front movement under the banner of joint struggle against fascism, under the banner of Dimitroff. During the two years that have passed, the united front in a number of countries has grown into a mighty movement of the masses. "Release Thaelmann", the call of the anti-fascist tribune, Georgi Dimitroff, has now become the war-cry of the international working class united front, the cry of all workers, all toilers, all supporters of liberty and justice.

* * *

On December 16, 1933, Dimitroff delivered his exceptionally forceful and profound final speech before the fascist tribunal. The main part of the speech was devoted to a defense of the Communist Party of Germany against fascist insinuations.

In this brilliant speech, Dimitroff proved, on the basis of indisputable evidence, that the direct task facing the Communist Party of Germany at the beginning of 1933 was, not an armed uprising, but mass work, mass struggle, mass resistance, the united front. Of course, the Communist Party of Germany like all the Communist Parties throughout the world, is fighting for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the proletarian revolution, for the violent overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie. Everybody knows that. The court, however, had to decide another question, namely: whether it was true that an uprising had been fixed for the purpose of seizing power in February, 1933. And Dimitroff, on the basis of evidence given by witnesses, on the basis of the three months trial proceedings, showed the absurdity of such an accusation. Dimitroff said:

> "It has been asserted here that the firing of the Reichstag was to be the signal for an armed uprising. . . . Goering has stated here, in court, that at the moment when Hitler came to power the Communist Party of Germany was compelled to inflame the feelings of its followers and to take some action. He said: 'The Communists were compelled to take some action—now or never.' He said that the Communist Party had for years been calling for a struggle against National-Socialism and that at the moment when the National-Socialists seized power, the Communist Party of Germany had no other choice but to act, now or never. . . .
>
> "To make such a supposition shows that the enemies of the Communist Party of Germany have a poor knowledge of it. . . . The outlawing of the party, the dissolution of the mass organizations, the loss of legal existence—all these, of course, were heavy blows at the revolutionary movement. *But this by no means signifies that all is lost thereby.*"

Dimitroff assured the court that the Communist Party of Germany, even though illegal, could bring about a revolution when the situation was favorable. In this connection, he pointed to the historic experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was an illegal party once, which suffered bloody persecution, but that later the working class guided by the Bolshevik Party came to power.

In his speeches at the trial Dimitroff raised the question convincingly and sharply of the attitude of the Communist Party to individual terror as a method of struggle. The Communist Party of Germany which had over 300,000 organized members and secured 6,000,000 votes at the last legal elections to the Reichstag could not use the methods of a conspirators' group. The Communist Party of Germany, true to the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, could not adopt the method of individual terror condemned by the doctrine of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In his first speech before the court on September 23, Dimitroff declared:

> "I am a determined opponent of the method of individual terror and putchism. And this is not out of sentimental feeling or humanitarianism. In complete agreement with the doctrine of Lenin, with the decisions and discipline of the Comintern, which are the highest law for me as for every real Communist, I am against individual terror and putschist adventures. I am guided by revolutionary expediency and the interests of the proletarian revolution and Communism."

Dimitroff smashed to atoms the charges leveled against Thaelmann by the fascists; in February 1933 the Communist Party of Germany had no intention of organizing an armed uprising, it categorically rejected individual terror as a method of struggle.

On the basis of concrete facts, Dimitroff gave brilliant proof of the fact that neither he nor the Communist Party of Germany had anything to do with the burning of the Reichstag. *This rendered it possible for him to take the offensive.* He boldly agreed with the thesis contained in the indictment to the effect that Van der Lubbe could not have set fire to the Reichstag himself, that he had accomplices, and that there was an organization behind him. But this organization could not be the Communist Party, for the fire was directed against it. This led with irresistible logic to the inevitable conclusion, a conclusion which tens of millions of people throughout the world had to draw, namely, that behind Van der Lubbe were the leaders of the National-Socialist Party.

It was not for nothing that the Leipzig court was forced to devote the first part of its verdict to a polemic against the "legend, that leading members of the German government had taken part in the burning of the Reichstag". This "legend" was the logical conclusion which flowed from every point advanced and supported with evidence by Dimitroff. It was proved by Dimitroff.

The remaining sections of the verdict, too, revealed quite clearly that Dimitroff drove the prosecution into an indefensible position. The verdict made helpless efforts to save the situation by formulating the reasons for acquitting the four prisoners in such a way (such and such evidence is "insufficient", "unconvincing", etc.) as to leave a shadow of suspicion behind. For had not these hints been left in the verdict, it would have been an out-and-out verdict against the National-Socialist Party.

A perusal of the verdict of the Leipzig court is enough to make one realize the importance of Dimitroff's behavior in court for mobilizing public opinion in Germany and throughout the whole world against fascism. For months Dimitroff, step by step and with extraordinary skill and persistence, riddled all the points in the indictment. He went into every detail, made use of every least legal opportunity, and displayed extraordinary skill in posing questions and interrogating the witnesses.

Dimitroff smashed all the accusations put forward by the enemy against the Communist Party of Germany, and gave convincing proof of the fact that it was only the leaders of the National-Socialist Party

who organized the burning of the Reichstag, who stood to gain by such an act. He thereby succeeded in winning the sympathy of millions of people who, although they not all supported Communism, were nevertheless indignant at the frame-up and the ferocities perpetrated by the fascist barbarians.

Dimitroff's behavior in court was an exceptional example of how to mobilize the broad masses in Bolshevik fashion against fascism. Lenin and Stalin incessantly taught Communists the art of mobilizing for the fight against the class enemy the millions who are not yet supporters of Communism. In Leipzig, Dimitroff showed that he was master of this art even under the incredibly severe conditions when the axe of the executioner was held over his head.

The Leipzig trial convinced millions of people throughout the whole world—even those who were still far from convinced of the correctness of Communism—of the falseness of the charges leveled not only against Dimitroff but against Thaelmann. The great proletarian revolutionary, Dimitroff, son of the heroic Bulgarian working class, reared and steeled in the revolutionary battles of the toiling masses, true disciple of the great leaders of the international proletariat, Lenin and Stalin, tore down the whole system of lies and provocation built around the Leipzig trial by the fascists, and thereby smashed also the indictment against Thaelmann.

* * *

The German proletariat regarded Dimitroff with joy and pride. The Social-Democratic workers proudly identified themselves with the bold Communist. His speeches in court not only unmasked the insinuations made by the fascists, but also made a gap in the wall of mistrust thrown up by the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy between the Social-Democratic and Communist workers.

Dimitroff's example inspired both the Social-Democratic and Communist workers of all countries. The Social-Democratic press could not remain silent concerning Dimitroff's exemplary behavior in court. It had to feature in its columns a Communist who was totally unlike the usual caricatures in which the representatives of Communism had hitherto been portrayed. Communists and Social-Democratic workers were inspired with one desire, namely, to fight for Dimitroff, against fascism. During the months of the Leipzig trial, before any united front pacts had been signed, a mighty working class united front movement against fascism was established, which despite the successes of the last two years is still in the early stages of its development and is spreading to more and more sections of the working class.

In February, 1934, a few months after the Leipzig trial, the Communist and Social-Democratic workers demonstrated jointly on the streets of Paris against the acts of provocation of the fascist leagues. The Communist Party of France headed the gigantic united front demonstration against the French fascist bands. A united front movement against fascism grew out of this joint action of the French workers, and became a factor of great political importance. The united front in

France has grown strong; and trade union unity is being brought about although there are still difficulties ahead. United action by the working class has attracted not only hundreds of thousands of workers who up to now have stood apart from political life, but also a considerable section of the middle class strata. There can be no doubt that fascism in France is a serious menace, but—as distinct from the position in Germany on the eve of the advent of Hitler to power—a united army of toilers is fighting against it. The counter-offensive of the people's front has more than once forced French fascism to drop the offensive and take up a defensive position. The task facing the united front movement in France now is to extend still further and lead big mass movements for the direct economic and political interests of the toilers against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, and against the menace of imperialist war.

In Austria the proletarian united front arose on the February barricades in 1934. United action was established between the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Socialists a few months after the February battles. The process of consolidating the united front has progressed considerably, trade union unity has been achieved.

In the autumn of 1934, the Spanish proletariat—Communist, Socialist and Anarchist workers—took up arms against fascism. In Spain today, where the united front still has serious difficulties to overcome, a broad anti-fascist people's movement is developing.

In Italy united action has been set up between the Communist and Socialist parties. The congress of Italian anti-fascists in Brussels has shown that there is every opportunity for the united front movement to become deeply rooted in Italy. In Germany, Left groupings have sprung up inside the Social-Democratic Party which are declaring for the united front; and united action with the Communists has been arrived at in many districts. In Poland, the movement for united action has recorded its first successes, and an opposition anti-fascist movement is growing against the rotten dictatorship of the Pilsudski gang. In countries where the most reactionary elements of the Second International are offering strong resistance to the united front, as is the case above all in Great Britain and Czechoslovakia, it is developing more and more powerfully in the lower bodies of the working class organizations on the initiative of the Communists: the Social-Democratic workers are more and more insistently demanding the establishment of united action with the Communists.

During these two years, the masses have widened the road pointed out to them by Dimitroff at Leipzig.

* * *

Dimitroff's proud words before the Leipzig court on the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union were an expression of living actualities even more majestic than his words. These living actualities, namely, the final and irrevocable victory of socialism in the Soviet Union under the leadership of our great Stalin—have imbued the international proletariat with new strength. The world historic victory of the working

class on one-sixth part of the earth, under the leadership of the party of Lenin and Stalin, and the defeat of the working class of Germany and Austria, who in their majority supported Social-Democracy—have led to the masses of Social-Democratic workers beginning to free themselves of reformist illusions and to declaring for the united front with the Communists.

True, the united front is developing unevenly. There are quite a few difficulties in its path. It is especially difficult to get joint action by the working class on an international scale, as recent events have shown (the refusal of the Executive Committee of the Labor and Socialist International to undertake joint action in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian war). But there is no force now that can break the desire of the masses for united action. The Communist International with Bolshevik persistence will strive for joint action in defense of the direct demands of the toilers, against the fascist drive and the menace of imperialist war. It will continue to fight for the united front until it is finally achieved.

When Dimitroff gave the signal at Leipzig for the offensive against fascism, it seemed almost impossible to heal the split in the ranks of the working class in all countries. Now the united front movement has become a big force in a number of countries. Today the hero of Leipzig is the helmsman of the Communist International. At the head of the Communist International there stands the best representative of the Bolshevik Stalinist guard that has grown up in the capitalist countries. *Dimitroff, the faithful, tried comrade-in-arms of the great Stalin, continued and developed the work begun at Leipzig still further at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, the congress which called for the application of the united front tactics in a new way, the congress of struggle for working class unity against fascism. Despite all the obstacles which lie in the way, the united front is marching forward.*

The most important immediate task facing the international working class united front at the present moment is to fight to secure the release of Thaelmann from the hands of the fascist executioners.

The battle on behalf of Thaelmann is a battle against fascism, a battle against the war instigators.

With the utmost passion and persistence, the Communists throughout the world must mobilize the masses, must arouse them to fight for the release of Thaelmann, who has been incarcerated in the dungeons of German fascism for three years. This is the fighting task before the international proletariat. This is the task facing all proletarians, all toilers in city and country, facing all who are indignant at the arbitrary behavior and barbarity of the fascists, facing all supporters of freedom and justice.

Proletarians throughout the world, respond to the call of Georgi Dimitroff, the great proletarian revolutionary: fight incessantly and persistently, exert all your efforts, adopt all measures to tear Thaelmann out of the bloody claws of fascism.

Teach the Masses—Learn from the Masses

ON the anniversary of the death of our great leader and teacher, Lenin, the world proletariat, in its struggle to abolish all forms of exploitation of man by man, in the struggle for the victory of Communism, reviews the achievements and tasks in realizing in life the great legacy of Lenin. And every year, when they turn to the great teachings of Lenin, the masses of the workers assimilate with exceptional vitality all those aspects of his teaching which stand out particularly clearly in their own experiences at the given stage of struggle. On the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of his death, one of these aspects is Lenin's appeal, not only to teach the masses, but to learn from the masses by carefully studying the practical experiences of their struggle.

> ". . . I do not know another revolutionary," writes Comrade Stalin, "who had such profound confidence in the creative forces of the proletariat and in the revolutionary expediency of its class instinct as Lenin did. . . . Hence Lenin's contempt for all those who tried superciliously to look down upon the masses and to learn about them from books. Hence Lenin's constant urging that we must learn from the masses, try to understand their actions and carefully study the practical experience of the struggle of the masses." *

Lenin built up a party of *a new type*, different from all the parties in the Second International, a party armed with the only really scientific theory, a party which is the vanguard of the working class. But precisely because this party is called upon to lead all other forms of proletarian organization, it must be closely bound up with them. Speaking of the development of the European Sections of the Comintern, after the Third Congress, Lenin drew attention to the fact that the most difficult and most important thing in the daily life of the Parties was to see that they become the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat, in ever closer union with them, raising them to revolutionary consciousness and the revolutionary struggle.

The greatest historical achievement in this heritage left to the world proletariat by Lenin is the *new type of state*—the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Soviet state. And one of the most important distinguishing features of the Soviet state is precisely this: that it gives unlimited opportunities to the masses for the development of their initiative and creative energy. Lenin pointed out on more than one occasion that only in the Soviets do the exploited masses really begin to learn, not out of books but out of their own practical experience, the work of socialist construction, and the building up of a new social discipline.

On the twelfth anniversary of the death of Lenin, the creative energy of the masses of the people of the Soviet Union has already risen to such a level of culture and technical efficiency that out of the heart of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. a new and a special kind of people has grown up, the Stakhanov movement has come into being.

* Stalin, *Lenin*, p. 28, International Publishers, New York.

At the same time the sharpening class struggle in the capitalist world makes the extremely imperative demand on the Communist vanguard of these countries that they "pursue an active Bolshevik mass policy to draw ever wider masses into the revolutionary class struggle and to lead them forward to the proletarian revolution, *basing on the starting point their vital interests and needs in the form of their own experience.* . . . The establishment of united working class action is the decisive stage along this road." (Dimitroff.)

Spring 1918. The young land of proletarian dictatorship is forced to accept the extremely burdensome Brest peace. Inside the country there is painful disorder, unemployment, hunger—the heritage of the imperialist war and of the rule of the bourgeoisie, supported by Menshevism and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries. The bourgeoisie overthrown but not yet crushed, in their utmost to secure the restoration of their power to exploit, speculation undermines revolutionary order throughout the land. The broad masses of the toilers are extremely weary and even exhausted. The country is in a state of economic breakdown, and the productivity of labor is extremely low. The bourgeoisie and their Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary agents try to undermine the Soviet Government by plots and uprisings, and shower a flood of jeering, insults, and poisonous calumnies upon it.

It was in a situation like this, in March-April 1918, that Lenin, in an article entitled "Current Tasks of the Soviet Government", raised in its full scope the question of the need to raise the productivity of labor in the land of proletarian dictatorship, and of socialist competition. Lenin stressed the point that in every socialist revolution, after the task of the proletariat winning power has been solved and to the degree that the expropriators are expropriated, the task comes to the forefront of raising the productivity of labor and of organizing it in the highest degree. He goes on to emphasize the fact that such a revolution can only be successfully accomplished "if there is the independent, intrepid, creative work of the majority of the population, and first and foremost of the majority of the toilers".

Lenin uttered a warning that the raising of the productivity of labor at that time in the Soviet Republic, especially after a tortuous and devastating war, required continuous work. One of the essential conditions for solving this task is that there should be a rise in the educational and cultural level of the masses, and an increase in the labor discipline of the toilers, and an ability to work and to organize labor better. What possibilities were there for achieving the second condition? In the spring of 1918, Lenin then wrote that: "This [educational and cultural—Ed.] advance of the masses is going forward with tremendous rapidity now, and this is something that people handed with bourgeois routine fail to see, since they are not capable of understanding the impulsive spurring after light and initiative that is now developing among the rank and file of the people, thanks to Soviet organization". The task of the Party is precisely this: to base itself on this impulsive spurring and initiative of the masses, who have only just shaken off the accursed savage yoke, and to promote from among them new organizers of the labor of the people.

> "There is a mass of organizing talent among the 'people', *i.e.*, among the workers and the peasants who do not exploit the labor of others; they were crushed, ruined and cast away in thousands by capital, we do not yet know how to find them, how to encourage them, to stand them on their feet, to advance them. But we shall learn this, if we settle down to do so with all the revolutionary enthusiasm, without which there are no victorious revolutions. . . ."

That of which Lenin wrote as of the future, for the achievement of which "long months and years" were necessary, has now become the present, the wonderful present of the great land of the Soviets. The Party of Lenin and Stalin has successfully directed the creative energy of the toilers among all the people of the Soviet Union towards the construction of a socialist society. The weak young land of the Soviets which was regarded as easy prey by all who hate socialism, by all capitalists hunting for plunder, has become the mightiest and most stable of world powers, the inaccessible fortress of the world proletariat. The backward, agrarian country which was reduced to severe economic ruin by the imperialist war, counter-revolutionary intervention, bourgeois sabotage, and speculation by the kulaks, has now become a steadily flourishing industrialized country. It has brought about the socialist reconstruction of the entire economic life of the country, and today has at its disposal technique of such a high order as is not inferior to the technique of the most advanced capitalist countries.

And at the same time as the material basis for a high productivity of labor was created, organizing talent was advanced from the heart of the masses of the people, and new cadres, new heroes of the labor of the people were trained and hammered out. Bolshevism, headed by Lenin and Stalin, carried the faith in the socialist victory of the working class, in the creative power of the masses, through all the trials of economic ruin, through all the difficulties of the restoration period. At the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., Comrade Stalin was able to point to the following fact as the most important achievement of industry during the period under review, namely, that "it succeeded in this period in training and hammering out thousands of new men and women, new leaders of industry, a whole stratum of new engineers and technicians, hundreds of thousands of young skilled workers who have mastered the new technique, and who advanced our socialist industry".*

On the basis of these achievements, Comrade Stalin made his historic statement on May 4, 1935, that now everything depends upon people who have mastered technique, and appealed to these people to squeeze the maximum possible out of technique. Can we doubt that the words of our leader which so rapidly called forth a mighty burst of impulse on the part of workers and collective farmers, that these words fell upon soil saturated with the creative power and enthusiasm of the masses?

> "What strikes one first of all is the fact that this movement began of itself, as it were, almost spontaneously, from below without any kind of pressure on the part of the administrations of our enterprises. Moreover, this movement originated and be-

* *Socialism Victorious*, p. 31, International Publishers, New York.

gan to develop in a certain measure against the will of the administrations of our enterprises, even in a struggle against them. . . . And it is precisely because it originated spontaneously, precisely because it comes from below, that it is the most vital and most irresistible movement of modern times." (Stalin)

In order to raise the working class to enthusiasm for labor, in order to bring broad masses of the peasantry into socialist construction, the party of Lenin and Stalin had to crush Trotskyism, Zinovievism, and the Right kulak deviation. And the bourgeois theory of the impossibility of building socialism in one single country, of the counter-revolutionary nature of the peasantry, of the inability of the proletariat to draw the basic masses of the peasantry into the work of socialist construction had to be buried. The Trotskyist lack of faith in the masses, the superior aristocratic attitude towards them, had to be exterminated.

In an article printed in *Pravda* on December 19, 1935, Comrade Krupskaya recalls how during the initial steps of the organization of industrial propaganda in the U.S.S.R. (1920-21), "Vladimir Ilyich upbraided Trotsky for his unwillingness to approach the solution of the question of industrial propaganda in a business-like manner, for his attempt to substitute 'theses of principle' for live work, for his underestimation of concrete conditions, and for his inability to approach the masses." In his speech on December 30, 1920, Lenin said:

". . . I am convinced that Trotsky has fallen into a number of mistakes connected with the very essence of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . But if this is left aside, then we must ask ourselves, why, indeed, is it that we cannot secure the good collective work we need? Because of differences on the question of methods of approaching the masses, of winning the masses, and of maintaining contacts with the masses. Herein lies the essence." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVI, p. 66, Russian ed.)

Only by successfully waging a relentless struggle, as Lenin taught us, against our class enemy and its agents—counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, the Zinoviev bands, the Right deviation and the kulak offspring, has the Party of Lenin and Stalin secured the complete triumph of emancipated labor in the Soviet Union.

Originating as an outburst of creative activity on the part of the masses, and meeting with an immediate response throughout the whole country, the Stakhanov movement, with its high productivity of labor, is creating new conditions for a sharp rise in the material and cultural level of the masses, for the solution of the task of educating the masses in the Soviet Union on socialist lines to an extent hitherto unheard of.

It was not Lenin's lot to live until the final and irrevocable victory of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, but in the Communist *subbotniks* he already saw the first green shoots of Communism. He pointed out at that time that "on this general background [the progress of the Soviet government all along the front—Ed.] and with the support of the proletarian government, the green shoots of Communism will not wither, but will spring up and mature into full-blown Communism."

By the twelfth anniversary of Lenin's death, this dream has already

become a reality. The Stakhanov movement not only makes possible in practice the further consolidation of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the latter's conversion into the most wealthy country in the world, but is also preparing the conditions already for the transition from socialism to communism.

* * *

The Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, as we know, re-examined the tactical line of the Communist International to correspond to the changed situation in the spirit, and with the help of the method, of living Marxism-Leninism, and on the basis of the extremely wealthy and instructive experiences of recent years. The Congress was able to prepare the ground for an unprecedented, broad mobilization of all the toilers against capitalism, precisely because it correctly adapted the Leninist principles of tactics in the new situation and with the new alignment of class forces. What are these principles, without which, as Comrade Stalin emphatically points out, it is impossible correctly to guide the revolution?

These are: First, the absolute necessity of reckoning with the national peculiarities in each individual country. Second, the absolute need for the Communist Party of each country to use every opportunity that arises to secure a mass ally for the proletariat, even if only a temporary and unstable one. Third, the necessity of taking into account the fact that for the political education of millions, propaganda and agitation are not sufficient. The masses require for this their own political experience. The Communist Party must therefore by the policy it pursues, by its actions, by the timely substitution of one slogan by another, help the broad masses to discover, on the basis of their own experience, that the Party line is a correct one, and lead them forward to revolutionary positions.

In his report at the Seventh Congress, Comrade Dimitroff reminded us that Lenin called upon us fifteen years ago to concentrate our attention "upon seeking forms through which the masses will *go over* to or *approach* the proletarian revolution". Under what conditions must the proletarian vanguard solve this task at the present time? One of the characteristic features of the present situation is that tremendous masses of toilers who, in "normal" times, stand aside from politics, are now being drawn into political life and are becoming active because of the course events have taken. The fascists are approaching these masses not only by making use of their prejudices but by appealing to their sharply increasing needs and growing anxieties. It is precisely because fascism is bringing the masses under its influence by the most monstrous, brazen deceit, that the mass base upon which it leans, and tramples upon, is its most vulnerable spot. It is, therefore, impossible to mobilize the broad masses against advancing fascism and to set them in motion except on the basis of their direct economic and political demands. In the fascist countries it is even more impossible to lead the masses to the decisive struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, except by drawing the toilers who are members of the mass fascist organizations into the most elementary movement in defense of their economic, political and cultural interests..

Lenin pointed out that "it is far more difficult and far more valuable to know how to be a revolutionary when there do not as yet exist conditions for a direct, open, really mass, really revolutionary struggle, to be able to defend the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organization) in non-revolutionary institutions, and frequently in openly reactionary institutions, and in a non-revolutionary situation, among the masses not able immediately to understand the need for revolutionary methods of action". Just then is it important to be able to find a concrete plan of measures which are not yet fully revolutionary, of methods and means which lead the masses up to the real, decisive, revolutionary struggle. Basing themselves on this, the Seventh Congress concretely determined the starting point and content of the working class united front at the given stage of struggle, and adopted a decision on the need for work inside the mass fascist organizations; on the non-party class organizations as the best forms for conducting and consolidating the united front among the rank and file; and that the proletariat must support the demands of the toiling masses that correspond to its basic interests; etc.

Lenin taught us to get our directions not from historical analogies and parallels, but from the study of the surrounding conditions. The Bolsheviks must base their activities not upon quotations and sayings, but upon practical experience, testing every step on the basis of experience, and learning from mistakes. Correspondingly, the Seventh Congress demanded that the Sections of the Comintern should in their approach to the masses consider the process taking place among these masses, as well as all the lessons of their own experiences. This means to take account of the changes which have taken place or are taking place in a number of countries in the position of Social-Democracy in the bourgeois state and its attitude to the bourgeoisie, of the process of differentiation in the ranks of Social-Democracy, of the reactionary role of its Right wing and the uneven revolutionizing process inside its Left wing, etc. The more rapidly the experience of the Social-Democratic masses is enriched by the practice of the class struggle the more certainly will the Communists be successful in undermining the influence of the reactionary camp of Social-Democracy and in accelerating the process of revolutionization inside its Left camp. The Communists will be able much more convincingly to explain the principles and program of Communism and to make their criticism of Social-Democracy the more they base this political educational work upon the experiences of the Social-Democratic masses themselves.

Lenin taught us that Marxism recognizes different forms of struggle, that "far from having any pretensions" about teaching the masses forms of struggle elaborated by office "systematizers", it generalizes, organizes, gives conscious shape to those forms of struggle of the revolutionary classes which have originated in the course of the movement. Guided by these laws of tactics, the Congress stressed the point that the united front in different countries will be concretely established in different ways, will take on different forms corresponding to the respective situation. In preparing the proletariat for rapid changes in the forms and

methods of struggle to suit the changing circumstances, the Communists must find the central issues in each country and at each stage of the struggle around which to unite the forces of the proletariat, to consolidate the toilers around the working class in a broad people's front, so that the main task confronting the international proletariat today can be realized. "It was not we who invented this task," said Comrade Dimitroff, "the experience of the international working class movement itself, and first and foremost the experience of the proletariat of France, put forward this task."

Lenin showed how the content and forms of the work of Communists must change with the transition from ideological to practical mass political action. Whereas in the first case, propaganda is of decisive importance, in the second case, propagandist habits and merely repeating the truths of "pure" Communism alone will achieve nothing. "Here we must ask ourselves not only whether we have convinced the vanguard of the revolutionary class, but also whether the historically acting forces of *all* classes, of all classes without exception of the given society, have been distributed in such a way as to ensure that the time for a decisive battle has matured. . . ." On the basis of this task of converting the Sections of the Comintern in the capitalist countries into real political parties of the working class, the Seventh Congress demanded that its Sections should not be satisfied with the mere propaganda of general slogans about the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet power, but that the Parties conduct a concrete active, Bolshevik policy on all the domestic and foreign problems of the given country, and on all present-day problems which concern the lives and interests of the working class of the given people and of the international movement.

True to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the leading role of the Communist Party, which, in its work, must combine the highest degree of principle with the maximum of contact with the masses, the Congress stressed the need to "safeguard the Bolshevik unity of the Party as the apple of the eye". Comrade Dimitroff emphasized that the consolidation of the Communist Parties does not constitute a narrow Party interest, but represents the interests of the whole of the working class. Lenin uttered a warning that the task of leading the masses forward to new gains cannot be done without eliminating "Left" doctrinaire methods, without completely overcoming its mistakes. In the changing objective situation and the development of Communist Sections, Leftist doctrinaire methods have often developed from an "infantile disorder" as Lenin wrote, into a deep-rooted vice, into self-satisfied sectarianism. Only by eradicating the remains of self-satisfied sectarianism and by increasing vigilance and the struggle against Right opportunism, the danger of which will grow as the broad united front develops, will the Communist Sections render themselves safe from becoming isolated from the masses and from dragging in the tail of events.

* * *

An enormous abyss lies between the attitude of Bolshevism and of reformism towards the masses. Reformism, the ideology and policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, is not only related to the bour-

geois attitude of superiority towards the masses, but is neither capable nor desirous of drawing lessons from the experiences of mass struggle.

We are witnessing today how the Right wing of Social-Democracy is doing its utmost to hinder the masses under its influence from understanding the causes of the advent of fascism to power and to recognize the forces which, having been brought about by the united front, have already shown that they are capable of offering resistance to the advance of fascism or of preventing the consolidation of the fascist power. Such a condescending attitude towards the urge for unity, which is the outcome of the sufferings of the working masses, is displayed in the barter by a number of "Left" leaders who, under the pressure of the masses, are first taking one step towards the united front and then deceive the masses once more by taking two steps backwards.

In the capitalist countries, the reformist pygmies which have led the masses to defeat, while displaying tremendous adaptability, are really ignoring and disregarding the actual experiences of the masses in the class struggle. In the Soviet Union, the leader of the international proletariat, Comrade Stalin, on behalf of the Soviet government and of the Communist Party, thanks the representatives of the Stakhanov movement which originated among the rank and file, for their lesson. We call to mind Lenin's advice, that we should not only teach the workers and peasants, but also learn from them. At the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, Comrade Stalin said:

> "I will not try to deny that the members of this conference have learned a thing or two at the conference from the leaders of our government. But neither can it be denied that we, the leaders of the government, have also learned from you Stakhanovites, from the members of this conference. So, then, we thank you comrades for the lesson, many thanks!"

All Comrade Dimitroff's speeches at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and his speech at the opening of the Sixth Congress of the Communist Youth International were saturated with appeals to learn constantly at every step in the struggle, to learn by their own experiences, as well as from experiences of the masses, to learn, so as to be able to swim as fast as possible in the turbulent waters of the class struggle. Comrade Dimitroff, by his personality, by his struggle, is a living example to the international proletariat of how to "combine the most intense passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and most sober evaluation of the mad ravings of the bourgeoisie". (Lenin.)

By the twelfth anniversary of the death of Lenin, all the forces of the toilers are mobilizing against capitalism as never before in the history of the struggle of the working class. They are mobilizing around the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, which is held high on the international arena by Comrade Dimitroff, the standard-bearer of the Comintern. The Sections of the Comintern in capitalist countries are being converted into Parties of Leninism, capable of giving the correct line to millions of the proletariat and of preparing, organizing and leading them forward to the decisive struggle against capitalism, for the victory of the revolution.

There Are No Grounds for Self-Satisfaction *

By O. KUUSINEN

COMRADES, there is no doubt that the Seventh Congress of the Communist International called forth great changes in the work of the Communist Parties. We notice everywhere serious efforts on the part of our Parties to apply the united front tactic. These changes, however, must not cover up our mistakes and shortcomings. The Secretariat, after establishing a number of such mistakes and shortcomings in the practice of our Parties, came to the conclusion that there is basis enough for discussing this question with the representatives of the Parties.

When the Seventh Congress of the Communist International demanded that all Communist Parties conduct concretely the united front policy, the Congress realized that in practice this would be no light task that could be solved without effort. Now we see that in practice the majority of the Communist Parties are taking the line of least resistance. Instead of a concrete united front *policy*, the only thing being done in the majority of cases is to conduct general *propaganda* in favor of the united front. Of course, with such an approach, the decisions of the Seventh Congress will not achieve their aim. The problem is to apply the policy concretely in practice, and it is especially in this that we are still very weak.

Our Parties have made quite a few united front proposals to the Social-Democratic Parties, but where these proposals have been rejected—that is, in the majority of cases—our Parties have not taken sufficient steps to develop independent mass action.

The schematic approach to the work of the Communist Parties was subjected to very sharp criticism in the resolution of the World Congress and particularly in the speeches of Comrade Dimitroff. The demand was also made that the tactics of the united front be applied "in a new manner". But we now see that in practice, in some cases, it is only this same schematic approach that is being applied in a new manner.

1. INSUFFICIENT ACTIVITY IN THE SPHERE OF ECONOMIC STRUGGLES

As a striking example of this, I wish to remind you of the fact that many of our Parties content themselves with general political slogans and underestimate the necessity to put forward demands which *deal with the immediate interests of the masses.*

Slogans such as "Peace and Freedom" and "Democratic Rights" are now in use everywhere, but the slogans of the *Struggle for Bread* are often forgotten. Comrade Marty has given us examples of this from France, but it is not in France alone that many Communists, while

* Report delivered on November 20, 1935, at a meeting of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. together with the representatives of the Communist Parties, on the shortcomings and mistakes in the carrying out of the united front policy laid down by the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern.

taking up the struggle for peace and freedom, leave the question of bread in the background. Peace and freedom, of course, are undoubtedly irreplaceable benefits, but every worker knows and feels that freedom without bread is not enough. In the same way, peace without bread is but little better for the workers in the capitalist world than the quiet of the graveyard. The scourge of hunger is the chief weapon in the hands of the capitalist slave-drivers.

You, certainly, remember well that the central thought of the resolutions of the Seventh Congress and of every speech made by Comrade Dimitroff was that the defense of the *immediate economic and political interests of the working class* must constitute the starting point and the main content of the policy of the united front. It is especially in the struggle for the defense of the *economic* interests of the working class that the activity of the majority of our Parties is particularly weak at the present time. But we cannot say that this weakness is based on *objective* conditions. On the contrary, it can rather be said that the objective conditions for the development of the economic struggles have become more favorable in a number of countries. But our Parties have made insufficient use of them.

Though it was absolutely incorrect that economic struggles were *impossible* during the crisis, as the reformists have claimed at the time, it is nevertheless a fact that economic struggles became far more difficult during the crisis. How did these difficulties arise? Primarily by the *pressure of widespread unemployment*. It is *from this* point of view that we must examine whether the objective conditions for the economic struggles have become better or not.

According to the information that I have received from Comrade Varga, the state of affairs as regards the labor market is as follows.

In general, the pressure of unemployment has grown less in most capitalist countries in the recent period. In Great Britain, for instance, the number of insured unemployed fell from the high point of almost three millions in January, 1932, to somewhat under two millions in September, 1935. In the U.S.A., the number of workers who have found employment in the last two years is estimated at 2,700,000 to 4,000,000. In Germany also, according to the statistics of the sick benefit societies, the number of employed workers increased from 12,700,000 to 16,000,000 between August 1932 and September 1935. No matter how unreliable these general figures may be, they show at any rate that the demand for labor power has somewhat grown.

There are, of course, countries where unemployment in 1935 was higher than before—France, Czechoslovakia, Poland and some others. It must also be borne in mind that the number of the unemployed varies from time to time. During the last few months, for example, a certain growth of unemployment has begun once more in the U.S.A. and in Germany. This is connected with seasonal and other fluctuations in production and with increasing intensification of labour. The size of the tremendous army of the unemployed is affected in particular by the ever growing inflow from the ranks of the young people who were born in post-war years (when the number of births greatly increased) and have now reached the working age.

It is not enough, however, to consider only the general unemployment figures in order to secure a correct appraisal of the conditions for economic struggles. It is necessary to consider unemployment in the individual industries, for there exist considerable variations between these. In Great Britain, U.S.A. and Germany, for example, there are some industries where the proportion of chronically unemployed has fallen almost to "normal", *i.e.*, to what it has been in capitalist industry before the crisis. But in other industries it still remains at a considerably higher level.

In Great Britain, the following figures show the percentage of unemployed among insured workers in various industries.

	Maximum before crisis, 1929	Maximum during crisis	September 1935
Manufacture of explosives	3.6	16.8	5.4
Automobile Industry	5.2	22.7	8.7
Chemical Industry	6.0	18.8	10.5
Coal	13.2	41.7	24.8
Shipbuilding	22.5	64.2	41.7

In the United States, if we take the level of employed workers in 1923-1925 as 100, the number employed in September 1935 has risen in comparison with the lowest point as follows:

	Lowest point	Sept. 1935
Machine Construction	47.1	91.1
Automobiles	42.0	95.1
Chemical Industry	71.1	110.7
Footwear	73.1	89.1
Rubber	59.8	81.1

In Germany, taking the high point of the pre-crisis period as the base, the percentage of employed workers in September 1935 rose from the lowest point as follows:

	Lowest point	Sept. 1935
Iron and Steel	42.5	81.8
Production of Means of Production	24.7	77.4
Manufacture of Consumption goods	47.7	61.7

Unemployment has shown the sharpest decline in those industries which are connected with the manufacture of munitions. But the decline in unemployment is also partially explained, particularly in the U.S.A., by some installation of new factory equipment, etc. As a rule, relations on the labor market have changed much less in favor of the workers in those industries which directly serve the needs of the broad masses.

A new phenomenon has become evident lately on the labor market —the *shortage of skilled labor power*. This is particularly the case in many of the war industries in Germany, in Great Britain (especially in the aviation industry) and partly in the U.S.A. This arises on the one hand from the fact that the volume of production in certain industries is higher than before the crisis, and on the other hand from the fact that the qualifications of some of the workers deteriorated during the crisis owing to prolonged unemployment, while only very few apprentices have received vocational training. In any case, it is undeniable that not only has the pressure of unemployment weakened in a number of

industries, but there even is in evidence a more or less considerable demand for skilled labor power.

If we thus study the concrete situation in each country, it can be seen that the conditions for the economic struggles have become *more favorable* in some industries, if not generally. This brings the workers and especially the Communists face to face with the task of increasing their activity accordingly. Every effort must be made to develop the economic struggles of the working masses and to achieve unity in these struggles. In the present situation, with the demand for labor power increasing and the pressure of unemployment weakening, even if only in a number of industries, the fighting spirit of the workers will considerably grow. We see this in Great Britain, for example, among the miners, 400,000 of whom voted in favor of a strike while there were only less than 30,000 votes cast against it.

The majority of our Parties take an unpardonably passive attitude towards these developments.

Even in France, the country where the Communist Party on the whole has conducted the united front policy most energetically and successfully, we find a great deal of passivity in the application of the united front in the economic movement.

According to the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, joint coordinated action has to be developed not only on a national scale but also on a local scale, even in *individual factories* and *in individual industries*, as well as special actions for the demands of the unemployed, the youth, women, peasants, etc.

Some comrades may object that it is not always easy in practice to bring about an agreement on common action with the Social Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions. Granted. But what remains to be done in such a case? Should we stand by with folded arms and merely continue simply to carry on propaganda in favor of the united front? This was not the opinion of the Seventh Congress. The Congress emphasized prominently:

> *"Without for a moment giving up their independent work in the sphere of Communist education, organization and mobilization of the masses*, the Communists, in order to render the road to unity of action easier for the workers, must strive to secure joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties, reformist trade unions and other organizations of the toilers."

Thus we must constantly strive to secure joint action, but irrespective of whether agreement is reached on joint action, Communists must not for a moment give up their independent work in the sphere of the education, organization and mobilization of the masses. Such was the opinion of the Congress.

2. ABSTRACT, SCHEMATIC APPROACH NOT YET ELIMINATED

The Congress pointed out that there are two sides to be distinguished in the tactics of the united front, both integrally connected with each other—the struggle for the immediate interests of the toiling masses and the struggle for the establishment of the united front. If we leave

the former of these without attention or relegate it to the background, if we conduct abstract propaganda for the united front, we shall sink once more into a lifeless, schematic way of doing things.

The Seventh Congress gave important directives as to the various aspects from which we can find the *correct slogans and forms of struggle* which will set the broad masses in motion even when we cannot reach an agreement on the united front.

These directives in the resolutions of the Seventh Congress could, of course, only be of a general character. The important thing is to apply them in practice. What was emphasized in them? It was stressed that we must launch slogans and use forms of struggle such as "arise from the vital needs of the masses and from the level of their fighting capacity at the given stage of development".

Consequently, in the putting forward of slogans and in developing forms of struggle, we must constantly, in the most conscientious manner, adhere to these two directives, basing ourselves, firstly, on the vital needs of the masses, and secondly, on the level of their fighting capacity at the given stage of development. With this aim we must accurately analyze the concrete vital needs of the masses and the level of their fighting capacity. If we do not pay attention to these circumstances, we cannot tell the masses *what they can and must do today* to defend themselves from capitalist robbery and the fascist offensive of the bourgeoisie. In practice, this is the most important thing in giving concreteness to the policy of our Parties.

But, this is the aspect in the practice of our Parties that is the weakest. We cannot say that our Party committees and organs sufficiently know, study and take into consideration the concrete vital needs of the workers, the sorest needs of the masses and the level of their fighting capacity at the given moment, and that *on this basis* they weigh the advisability of slogans and forms of struggle. But as long as they do not do this, as long as they do not set aside the old bad methods and do not put a stop to the practice of bringing forward long lists of partial demands which they have taken from the air, as long as they do not learn to work out practical slogans of action and *programs of action* on the basis of an all-round knowledge of the economic and political situation and of the level of the fighting capacity of the working masses at the given moment, then we must say that they have not learned the method of Bolshevik mass policy. The policy of the united front in its very essence must consist of this very concrete mass policy.

In a capitalist country we are not in a position to place any question we might desire on the order of the day in the political life of the country. We often have to seize on questions which our opponents raise. It is even more important to listen to the voice of the masses, to find out what their demands are and what urgent questions are most deeply agitating them. How often do our comrades repeat in articles and resolutions that they are fighting for the demands of the working masses, whereas in practice, the demands advanced by the Communists—good demands "in themselves"—do not correspond to the concrete demands for which the masses, at the given moment, want to fight. We must draw

lessons from this, for there are still many cases showing that the immediate interests of the working masses and of other strata of the toilers, particularly their economic interests, are expressed in too schematic a manner in the slogans of the Parties or are relegated to the background.

Of course, this is not the only form of schematic approach by our Parties. There are other examples showing the same abstract approach. The manner of raising the question of a *government of the united front*, for example, may easily give rise to such an incorrect interpretation. Such an example we have in France. In that country, the question of the united front government was raised by some comrades without any connection with the specific condition of the political crisis, and especially without any connection with the upsurge of the mass movement. The government of the people's front was spoken of in such a vague and general form that this government could have been understood to be just an ordinary Left bourgeois government.

This differs widely from the conception developed by Comrade Dimitroff at the Congress. First of all, he did not set forth the government of the people's front as an "aim in itself", but as one of the possibilities in the path towards the proletarian dictatorship and to Soviet power. Secondly, his arguments were aimed at showing that one of the chief shortcomings in the treatment of these questions at the Fourth and Fifth Congresses of the Comintern was the fact that the question of a workers' and peasants' government was raised without any connection with the situation, *i.e.*, irrespective of a mass upsurge and of the situation in the political crisis. It was due to this that mistakes of a Right opportunist or Leftist nature were made and the question could not be correctly solved.

This lesson, after the report of Comrade Dimitroff, should have been clear to all comrades, but this was not remembered by all. I have to admit, however, that in the last few weeks, the leaders of the C.P. of France, especially Comrade Thorez, have brought clarity into this question, so that it does not cause confusion in France. In addition to this, Comrade Thorez has made a very valuable proposal with the aim of strengthening the united front in France.

The question of *political unity* is similarly raised so abstractly in some cases as if it had the same form and importance in the different countries.

3. MISTAKES AND SHORTCOMINGS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR AND THE WAR DANGER

War has been in full swing for many weeks and the danger of a world war is growing with each week. But most of the Communist Parties are conducting the struggle on this question with insufficient energy.

I do not wish to state that no struggle at all is being carried on. As you know, various demonstrations and protest meetings against war have been held in a number of countries. Even strikes were declared in a number of cases, and the Communist press is everywhere conducting a more or less energetic campaign against war.

But unless I am mistaken, the activity of the majority of our Parties has weakened rather than strengthened in the last few weeks, that is to say, since the war actually started. At the very beginning of the war they made bigger and more successful efforts. Is this the case or is it not? The comrades who know the situation in their own countries better must answer this question. In general, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the struggle of the Communists on this matter is limited mainly to a campaign in the press and possibly to a lot of speeches on the united front which give very scanty results.

Under the pressure of the reactionary leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties, the Executive Committee of the Second International rejected our proposal for an international united front. But even the Executive Committee of the Second International dared not prohibit the Social-Democratic Parties of individual countries from coming to an arrangement with the Communist Parties on the united front. It is therefore necessary in the first place to continue our efforts for creating a united front in the various countries for the fight against the war. In the second place, in those places where, despite all our efforts, no united front can be brought about on this question, where we cannot make a united front with the Social-Democratic Parties or where we are not even able to bring about a united front agreement with the local organizations of the Social-Democratic Parties, are we to do nothing in such places? It is obvious that we Communists must appeal in such places to the working class, organize independently protest meetings, demonstrations against the war as well as other mass actions, and do everything in general that is in our power to set the broad masses into motion.

Thirdly, a campaign must be carried on against the reactionary leaders of the Second International who disrupted international unity of action against the war. But this campaign has not yet been developed.

In connection with our united front proposals, some of the leaders of the Second International got into a difficult situation at first. Anxiety was very noticeable among the leading personages of the Second International during the first few weeks after the Communist International published its proposal. Some of them wavered, fearing the results of their rejection of the Comintern proposal to form the united front. The majority were even afraid to say openly at the session of the Executive Committee that they were against the united front and they hid behind the backs of the representatives of the five Parties and gave as their reason for rejecting the Comintern proposal that the representatives of five Parties did not want it and they had to reckon with the opinion of these Parties.

It can now be seen that these people have gained courage once more, since we are not conducting any campaign against the infamous decision of the Executive Committee of the Second International. Once more they are making impudent attacks on the Communist Parties in their press, with the aim of continuing the split in the working class. They play upon sanctions and try to lead the masses simply into supporting the Anglo-French policy of the League of Nations on the

Ethiopian question, while our Parties have not yet succeeded in exposing the imperialist nature of this policy (for example, the plan for the partition of Ethiopia) in such a manner that the people could understand it.

Allow me to give a few examples.

The British Labor Party was one of the Parties whose representatives were directly responsible for the rejection of our united front proposals by the Executive Committee of the Second International. At first, in the central organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the *Daily Worker*, the statement of the E.C.C.I. was published in which these people—Dallas, Compton, and others who disrupted the international united front—were arraigned before the judgment of the international proletariat. But after publishing this statement our paper forgot about the matter. On the very next day—November 7—the *Daily Worker* published Compton's own electoral manifesto without making any criticism of his conduct on this matter in Brussels.

The Swedish Social-Democrats, Lindstrom and Heglund, also belong to the wreckers of the international united front. But the central organ of our Swedish Party did not carry on any campaign about their conduct in Brussels. Mr. Heglund spoke in Stockholm in defense of the position of the Second International and especially of his own conduct. He even repeated the old slander that the Comintern proposal for the united front was merely a "maneuver". Our Communist paper considers that it is not worth while criticizing Heglund and contented itself with publishing his speech—for information purposes!

It is difficult for workers to see any basic difference between the points of view of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties on the question of sanctions and on the role of the League of Nations. This shows how little our comrades have succeeded in distinguishing themselves from the Social-Democrats on this question, and this is utilized by the followers of Chilbom, who comes out with Trotskyite arguments against sanctions in general.

Things are almost the same in Norway. The Communists are satisfied to bring pressure to bear on the Social-Democratic government to make it insist on the necessity for the League of Nations to use sanctions. They do not explain to the workers that the League of Nations, owing to imperialist contradictions, is incapable of using effective measures to prevent war and that the League of Nations itself can only be moved to take more serious steps if the working masses develop independent joint activity against war.

In Canada also our press at first took up a stand *in opposition* to sanctions, which created the impression that the leaders of the Labor Party occupy a more correct position. Before the Party rectified this mistake, confusion was created which helped to weaken the struggle for the united front.

On this question the American *Daily Worker* boosted Otto Bauer with a big headline—"Otto Bauer Points Way to Working Class Unity Against War." Otto Bauer had only written of the possibility that some of the Socialist Parties would exchange information and opinions

with the Comintern on this question, and even this not for the purpose of arriving at an agreement. This was sufficient for the *Daily Worker* to ask:

> "But will the American Socialist Party go along with these people [the Old Guard—*Ed.*]—whose bitter opposition to the united front is actually a fight to maintain their own united front with the capitalists—or *will it go along with Otto Bauer, with the Socialist Parties of France, Austria, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the Polish Bund, the Mensheviks,* with the progressive forces in all Socialist Parties?"

This is what is called journalism in America! Even the Mensheviks, who long since received their final sentence from history, who have long since existed as the dead corpse of a counter-revolutionary party, even they are classed as one of the "progressive forces" in the working class movement.

I can fully understand that the editors of the *Daily Worker* wanted to demonstrate their skill in distinguishing between enemies and allies. But when this is turned into a caricature it does not make the task of the Party easier, but on the contrary more difficult.

Thus there are big shortcomings and mistakes in the work of our Parties on this extremely important sector of the front.

4. CRITICISM OF THE REACTIONARY POLICY OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IS BLURRED

The last examples I gave indicate that there are serious shortcomings and mistakes in the approach of some of our comrades to the Social-Democrats.

As we know, the Seventh World Congress gave our Parties new and important directives on the tactics to be adopted towards Social-Democracy—that the united front tactics must be operated in a new manner, that the process of differentiation within Social-Democracy must be taken into account and a varied approach made to the various Social-Democratic camps and tendencies and even to individual Social-Democratic functionaries; that we must generally in our criticism of Social-Democracy argue in a businesslike manner, etc. Yes, our World Congress demanded all of this. But our World Congress did not say that we must give up all our criticism of Social-Democracy or abandon the struggle against the reactionary part of Social-Democracy. In the practice of some of our Parties, it sometimes seems as if some of our comrades must have understood the directions of the Seventh World Congress in just such a false manner. I wish to remind you first of all what the World Congress said on the struggle in principle against Social-Democracy.

> "Joint action with the Social-Democratic Parties and organizations," the Congress emphasized, "not only does not preclude but, on the contrary, *renders still more necessary* the serious and well-based criticism of reformism, of Social-Democracy, as the ideology and practice of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and the patient exposition of the principles and program of Communism to the Social-Democratic workers."

This criticism of the principles of Social-Democracy and the strengthening of the propaganda for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for Soviet Power was regarded by the Seventh World Congress as a necessary development of the tactics of the united front which must not be neglected when joint actions take place.

The Seventh Congress further demanded that Communists increase their struggle against the reactionary path of the Social-Democrats and at the same time that they establish close cooperation with those Left Social-Democratic workers, functionaries and organizations which fight against the reformist policy and which stand for the united front with the Communist Party.

> "The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of Social-Democracy which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of Social-Democracy which is becoming revolutionized."

Consequently, the task of encouraging revolutionization inside Social-Democracy presupposes an increased struggle against its reactionary part.

> "Within the Left camp," says the Congress, "the self-determination of the various elements will take place the sooner, the more resolutely the Communists fight for a united front with the Social-Democratic Parties."

Thus the Seventh Congress demanded that we fight for the united front, and not at all that we cease fighting. *It is impossible to achieve the united front without fighting for it.* If there were no opponents of the united front, then we could simply shout, "Hail the united front"! But things are not as simple as all that. The united front can only be achieved by a struggle. In the first place, by an increased struggle against the *open* enemies of the united front. In the second place, by criticism of the concealed enemies of the united front—this is no less necessary. In the third place, by correct tactics towards those Social-Democrats who readily accept the united front in words but do nothing in practice to bring it about. With such Social-Democratic leaders, too, we cannot make one single step forward by being complacent towards them. What did the Congress say of these leaders?

> "The attitude to the practical realization of the united front will be the chief indication of the true position of the various groups among the Social-Democrats. In the fight for the practical realization of the united front, those Social-Democratic leaders who come forward as Lefts in words will be obliged to show by deeds whether they are really ready to fight the bourgeoisie and the Right Social-Democrats, or are on the side of the bourgeoisie, that is, against the cause of the working class."

As you see, the Seventh World Congress gave absolutely clear directions. But is the practice of our Parties equally clear? No. There are plenty of cases in which our comrades deliberately avoid criticizing

the reactionary steps of the Right Social-Democrats, cases when they react feebly or not at all to the actions of these Rights or when they restrict themselves simply to defense against the most brazen attacks of the reactionary Social-Democrats. In past years, many Communists replaced business-like criticism of Social-Democracy with mere denunciation. Now it happens that the necessary serious business-like criticism is replaced by silence. This shows how well founded was the warning given by the Congress that the *Right danger will grow* when the tactics of united front are widely applied.

In Great Britain at the beginning of the election campaign, the criticism of the Labor Party by the Communist Party was pushed far into the background. The resistance of the Labor leaders to the united front was not criticized either in the press or among the voters. It is true that as the election campaign proceeded the Party corrected these omissions, but this took quite a long time. The chief paper of the Labor Party, the *Daily Herald,* played a double game towards our Party. In its edition for South Wales, where Comrade Pollitt was a candidate, the *Daily Herald* was full of attacks on the Communists. But in the London edition, before the London electors, where our support was very valuable for the Labor Party, the *Daily Herald* refrained from attacks on us. This double game of the *Daily Herald* was not exposed by our press, and the difference between the Communist Party and the Labor Party was not clearly shown before the workers.

Here is an example from Czechoslovakia. A few weeks ago the Social-Democratic trade-union leader Gampel spoke at the Congress of the Metal Workers' Union. He advocated the unity of the metal workers' trade unions, but expressed the opinion that this unity must take place simply on the basis of the Social-Democratic platform, by the members of the Red trade unions joining the Social-Democratic union. Such was the gist of his speech. The central organ of our Party, *Rude Pravo,* welcomed Gampel's speech as a step forward and gave up all criticism of Gampel.

The readers were left under the impression that Gampel spoke actually in favor of trade-union unity.

A little later this same Gampel spoke at the Prague Conference of the Czech Social-Democratic Party, and there he showed still more clearly that he merely wished to mask the old Social-Democratic policy of splitting the working class and of defeating the Communist Party with the words "unity of the working class". Gampel's tactics fully conform with the point of view of the leading bodies of the Czechoslovakian Social-Democratic Party. The Social-Democratic paper *Pravo Lidu* also commented on Gampel's speech in the following words:

> "All sections of Social-Democracy are advancing towards the objective of uniting the forces of the working class of Czechoslovakia on the ideological basis of constructive socialism. This presumes that the other big Socialist Parties, the National Socialists as well as a large part of the membership of the Communist Party are to a considerable degree already ripe for such a decision."

In reply to this statement in *Pravo Lidu* and the speeches by Gampel, the Communist paper, *Rude Pravo*, stated among other things the following:

> "Gampel's remarks give us great satisfaction and is the result of many years of our work. . . ."

The polemics of the Communist paper were not directed against Gampel and the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party but only against the extreme Right Social-Democrat, the Minister of Railways, Bechyne, who also advocates a united front, but on the basis of class cooperation with the bourgeoisie. In *Rude Pravo* even criticism of the Benes Party and its trade unions is blurred over. Their leaders also advocate "unity", but it is unity on the basis of the "state and nation", on the platform of Czech National Socialism. And *Rude Pravo* in an opportunist manner presents all this as a "step forward" towards the unity of the working class!

I have already mentioned how the *Daily Worker* in the United States praised Otto Bauer and the Mensheviks. But as Otto Bauer and the Mensheviks are foreigners, it may be assumed that the editors did not know these people sufficiently. But they must have had a good knowledge of John Lewis, the miners' leader, who has been carrying on a fierce struggle for many years to throw the Communists out of the miners' union. At the last convention of the A. F. of L., Lewis proposed that Matthew Woll, vice-president of the A. F. of L., should not in the future occupy the post of acting president of the National Civic Federation. This is an organization of big industrial magnates in which, for the purposes of class collaboration, several of the higher functionaries of the A. F. of L. were also included. This being the case, Lewis' proposal was a correct one. But, that this was only a harmless blow at Matthew Woll can be seen from the circumstance that Woll himself, immediately after the proposal was introduced, hastened to resign by telegraph from his position in the National Civic Federation. But just imagine how our *Daily Worker* later lauded this proposal of Lewis'! It carried a big headline: "Lewis' Resolutions Strike Blow at Class Collaboration." And it continued in an energetic style:

> "Yesterday the Fifty-fifth Convention of the American Federation of Labor got a glimpse—brief, but unforgetably vivid—of the parting of the ways.
>
> "The voice of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, must have sounded like the crack of doom in the ears of Matthew Woll and the extreme Tory wing of the A. F. of L. Executive Council. The two resolutions introduced by Lewis objectively hit at the foundations of the whole traditional class collaboration policy of the A. F. of L. leaders. . . .
>
> ". . . through him there spoke not only the half million members of the U.M.W.A., but all that is best, most clear-sighted and progressive in the American trade-union movement," etc., etc.

The readers of the *Daily Worker* could not but think after this pæan

of praise that the notorious Lewis had suddenly become a hero, while in reality he is simply playing a new role. He voted in the same session, not, it is true, for the immediate expulsion of Communists, but for the autonomous right for the unions to expel Communists. The papers now inform us that this same person has participated in a frenzied campaign against the import of Soviet coal into America.

It is plain, comrades, that this paper gave way in this case to opportunist "backsliding" which has nothing in common with the recommendations of the Seventh Congress on differentiated tactics. It is obvious that you must take into account even small contradications between the various reformist and Social-Democratic leaders and use them in the interests of the unity of the working class. We have also no objection, of course, if a distinction is made between Otto Bauer and extreme reactionaries and even between John Lewis and Matthew Woll. But this is not the point. I am dealing with the fact that some Communists have stopped criticizing people like Otto Bauer and John Lewis altogether. Negotiations can and must be conducted with such people on unity of action, but wherever there is a need for business-like criticism, this criticism must not be replaced by praise. These are not our united-front tactics but opportunist tactics, if the possibility of negotiating with the reformist leaders is bought at the cost of a systematic refusal to appeal directly to the masses, so as not to irritate these leaders and to prevent "unity" with them.

The Seventh Congress did not have such an idea of the tactics of the united front.

A different kind of tactical mistake was made in Denmark. The Communists during the election campaign continued in the old sectarian manner to lump all the Social-Democrats in one category. It was just as if the directions of the Congress on the necessity of differentiated tactics had not been written for Denmark. The Seventh Congress gave special directives on how to apply the united front in countries where a Social-Democratic government is in power. I do not want to repeat here all that was said by Comrade Dimitroff in great detail on this question. I will only refer to his advice to take from the electoral promises and other platforms of the Social-Democratic Parties individual demands which correspond to the interests of the working class and come to the Social-Democratic workers and organizations in this way: Here are the demands of your own party. We Communists support these demands. We propose a united front on the basis of these demands. If the Danish Party had used this method instead of its sectarian approach, it is possible that it would have established contacts with part of the Social-Democratic workers and organizations. But it did not consider this advice of Comrade Dimitroff.

In Denmark, as in the Scandinavian countries in general, and also in Holland, the struggle against the *Trotskyite* danger is also a task demanding constant vigilance and activity.

But in Scandinavia the Communists do not pay practically any attention to this question even up to the present time. In the same way, it is necessary in other countries to react more actively than

hitherto to Trotskyite slander, for such slander, though issued at first by Trotskyites themselves, is frequently spread by all kinds of "Left" Social-Democrats and Socialists.

Thus, the despicable slander on Comrade Stalin which could only have been fabricated by so vile a person as Souvarine was warmed up by Otto Bauer. He tried by the spicy flavor of his reservations to make this disgusting Souvarine dish palatable for the Social-Democratic readers. Firstly, such acts on the part of the "Left" Otto Bauer must be condemned; and secondly, the counter-revolutionary meaning of the concerted fight of the Trotskyites against the personality of Comrade Stalin must be exposed to the limit. At bottom, it is nothing but a fight against the Soviet Union and against the cause of the revolution of the whole international proletariat. Anyone who attacks the person of the great leader of the international and Soviet proletariat is serving the interests of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Although most of the examples given show primarily only the shortcomings and mistakes of the Communist press, it would be incorrect to think that these mistakes and shortcomings are not of great importance. We well understand that it is not correct and not necessary to examine every newspaper article under a microscope so as to seek out little accidental mistakes. But here we are dealing not with accidental mistakes, but with such that serve as a danger signal. We must in good times rouse therefore the watchfulness of the Sections of the Communist International to this danger.

But I may be asked, are there no successes to be noted in the application of the united-front policy of our Parties. Naturally many successes could be recorded. If we were to consider this side of the question, there is no doubt that it would be found that every Communist Party in the last period has achieved some successes.

But we are speaking today not of successes but of omissions and deviations which must be rectified as rapidly as possible.

There cannot be any doubt whatsoever that the idea of the united front is gaining headway among the broad masses of the toilers. *The united front movement* is developing at a rapid speed, particularly *from below*. But in many cases it is developing absolutely spontaneously, without Communist leadership. There is a danger that Communists will drag at the tail of the movement. The Communists have not the necessary initiative. There are many cases in which the enemies of the Communist Party have seized the initiative in various campaigns. In Sweden, for example, the campaign against the increase of the war budget by the Social-Democratic government was developed at the initiative of the Kilbom Party. Such examples show that the emphasis of the Seventh Congress that the mobilization of the broad masses of toilers depends to an important degree on the development of the initiative of the Communist Parties was correct.

The political reorganization of the purpose of establishing concrete leadership of the mass movement, which the Seventh Congress demanded

from the Communist Parties, is still in its initial stage and is far from completed. After the prolonged privations during the crisis and the depression, a ferment is already beginning among the masses in many countries. But the concrete leadership of the mass movement by our Parties is mostly still very weak.

All our comrades must fully realize in each separate case what is and what is not in practice the line of the Seventh Congress. If I had to sum up in a few points, I should like to recommend to our comrades at the present time to consider above all the following points:

1. The line of the Seventh Congress on the carrying through of the policy of the united front requires a struggle not only for the basic political slogans of the Parties, but also for the immediate interests and concrete everyday demands of the masses.

2. It is not enough to address united front proposals to the national leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties, but it is necessary to constantly struggle to bring about common action on a local scale, in individual factories, and in individual industries.

3. Communists must not take the line of *only* making united front agreements and nothing else. They must not for a moment give up the independent education, organization and mobilization of the masses.

4. The formation of the united front without a struggle against its enemies and those who sabotage it is impossible. This struggle must not weaken but must grow *stronger* both in the economic and political struggles, in the anti-war movement and in the movement against fascism.

5. The line of the Seventh Congress requires a struggle *not only* against Left sectarianism but also against the Right danger in all its concrete manifestations. "Self-satisfied sectarianism" must be rooted out, but must not be replaced by self-satisfied passivity.

And so, every kind of opportunist passivity in carrying out the decisions of the Seventh Congress must be done away with.

It is particularly important to ensure the organizational consolidation of the united front movement. The World Congress strongly emphasized the necessity for forming non-party, class united front bodies. But we are only at the outset of solving this task in all the capitalist countries. We must not forget, however, that Bolsheviks are never satisfied with developing some campaign, that they at the same time take care that the mass influence they obtain is organizationally consolidated.

In all capitalist countries, the Party press must be mobilized for properly carrying out the decisions of the Seventh World Congress. The leading bodies of the Communist Parties are faced with the urgent task of doing everything in order that not only shall individual mistakes be corrected in the practice of our Parties, but that a real Stakhanovite scope is attained in the development of the Bolshevik policy of the united front.

This will be a reliable guarantee for great successes for the united front in the struggle against war, fascism and capitalism.

Urgent Problems Facing the Communist Party of Germany

By M. ERCOLI

COMRADES, in the name of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, I bring hearty, fraternal and militant greetings to the Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Germany. (*Stormy applause, the delegates rise; Comrade Pieck calls for a triple and mighty "Red Front" for the C.P.S.U. and "our splendid teacher of mass work, the leader of the world working class, Comrade Stalin".*) I have been entrusted particularly with the task of bringing hearty greetings to your conference from our General Secretary, Comrade Dimitroff, who, at the Leipzig trial, was the first to show the German toilers the way to struggle against fascism, and who from the tribune of our Seventh World Congress showed the masses of workers throughout the world how to fight against fascism and how to smash it. (*The delegates rise. Stormy and continuous applause. A triple resounding "Red Front" is given for the Comintern and its helmsman, Comrade Dimitroff.*)

Comrades, the Communist Party of Germany, prior to the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, was not only the biggest section of the Communist International in the capitalist countries, but it was also the Party which had achieved the greatest successes on the path of Bolshevization. It had the best and firmest cadres. It had a proletarian leader such as Comrade Thaelmann, trained and steeled in the struggle of the Party against sectarianism and against Right and "Left" opportunism.

(*Stormy applause, the delegates stand. A triple and powerful "Red Front" is given for Comrade Thaelmann.*)

Your conference is the first Party conference held after the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern. The experience accumulated by your Party prior to and since the establishment of the fascist dictatorship stood in the center of the attention of the Congress. All the more responsible, then, is the task facing you of establishing all the pre-conditions for really putting into effect the decisions of the Seventh World Congress. The conference has already shown that the Party possesses sufficient forces, and that its old and new cadres are really capable of working and carrying on the struggle in the spirit of the Seventh World Congress. All this enables us today to express with complete clarity, exactness, and Bolshevik honesty, our collective opinion about the situation in our Party, about its defects and lapses, and about the tasks facing it. The following four main tasks face your conference, *viz.*:

1. To make a concrete and business-like analysis of the objective situation in Germany, a correct evaluation of our enemy, fascism, of its

strong and weak points; a concrete analysis of the relations between the classes in the country, and on the basis of this analysis to establish the perspectives for the near future.

2. To work out a political program on the basis of which it will be possible to muster all the forces which are eager to carry on the struggle against fascism, so as to promote a wide anti-fascist movement in the country, and to create the pre-conditions for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

3. To make a concrete estimate of the forces of the Party, and secure a fundamental and business-like self-criticism of the mistakes committed by the Party, especially after the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship, mistakes which have prevented the Party up till now establishing a wide mass movement against fascism.

4. To work out a political and organizational platform on the basis of which all the healthy forces in the Party could be united in the struggle to overcome the present difficult situation in the Party, and to solve the most immediate tasks facing it.

The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International provided us with the main line for solving all these tasks. The conference has raised a number of important problems.

The last big discussion held in the leading bodies of the Communist International on questions affecting the German Party was that which took place in January of this year [1935] in the Political Commission and the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. There can be no doubt that following this discussion a certain improvement could be noted in the situation in the leadership of the Party. In January the majority of the Political Bureau of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany still followed an incorrect line, one which did not correspond to the line of the Communist International. At that time we did not in the least hesitate to support the minority of the Political Bureau, being profoundly convinced that all the forces of the Party could be rallied on the basis of the line of the Communist International. This conference shows that this has really taken place.

The situation in Germany is a tense one. The international situation is tense in the highest degree. A war has begun which may turn into a European, into a world war. German National-Socialism is playing the chief role in Europe in kindling a new imperialist war. We may expect sharp turns in Germany in the near future. The Party has already lost plenty of time.

We must secondly recognize that among nearly all comrades there is to be observed a certain degree of complacence which prevents them from measuring the full depth and difficulty of the problems which now face the working class of Germany, and the Communist Party of Germany.

The situation in your Party and the tasks facing it are very serious. In 1933, the Party suffered a heavy defeat. Its transition to illegal conditions cost it too dear. The Party lost the majority of its old cadres. A great part of the forces of the Party are now dispersed, while the

Party membership has seriously declined. The Party did not succeed in the first months of the fascist dictatorship in reorganizing itself, in adapting its tactical line and its organizational forms and methods of struggle to correspond to the new conditions. This led to the Party missing the opportunity which arose when fascism was subjected to a serious convulsion (June 30, 1934). And at the present time, as Comrade Pieck has stated in his report, the Party has not been able to utilize the internal contradictions of fascism. In such a situation we must sound the alarm, so that all comrades may understand that we must muster all our forces, and put an end to the present serious situation within the Party.

Our third remark refers to the way we appraise our opponent, fascism. You all know that the main source of all the political and tactical mistakes made by our Party, prior to and after the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship, has been an underestimation of fascism. Both comrades who reported were absolutely correct in stressing this point. But, comrades, we have the impression that even now there is still within the Party an underestimation of fascism. Wherein lies this underestimation? One gets the impression that comrades are afraid to look the enemy in the face, and to openly investigate on what fascism bases itself, and what are its strong and weak points. But unless we make a fundamental study of our enemies we cannot establish correct tactics for our Party, and it is impossible to take the correct road enabling us to smash our enemy. Articles and speeches made by our German comrades do not provide a fundamental analysis of the strength of the fascist party, of its composition, of its structure, and of its cadres, and of the changes which have taken place in all these spheres since the seizure of power by the fascists. But unless such an analysis is made, it will be very difficult for the Party to correctly apply the tactics of penetrating into the fascist camp, and of utilizing the internal contradictions of the fascist dictatorship.

Most interesting in this respect were the speeches of some of the comrades from the lower Party organizations, who gave a lively account of how they succeeded in setting the workers in the factories into motion, making their starting point the immediate and smallest demands of the working class themselves. All these examples of mass movements, which in greater part have been spontaneous or semi-spontaneous, must be still more seriously studied by the Central Committee of the Party and by the conference itself. But we must recognize that a certain limitedness is also to be observed in the remarks made by the comrades of the lower Party organizations: they see their workshops, their pits, their mines; they see the enemy who stands directly in front of them; but they do not see the forces of fascism as a whole, and therefore they are not in a position to react on their own initiative, correctly and quickly, to the entire policy of fascism. Only a few of the comrades from Germany itself have attempted to give a concrete picture of the situation of the inner life of the fascist organizations of their district as a whole; still less were attempts made on the basis of this analysis

to show what are the immediate tasks facing the entire Party organization.

Only individual comrades have paid attention to the mass discontent, the protests and the possibility of developing a wide mass movement around the question of the high cost of living and the shortage of foodstuffs, yet it is just this question today which is assuming tremendous importance in Germany. It is closely connected with some of the most important and fundamental contradictions which are now being intensified in the camp of the bourgeoisie and even in the fascist camp. What line do our comrades working in the country propose, on the basis of their practical experience in the lower Party organizations, so that they may play an active and leading role in this movement?

If we sum up all these weak points and defects, we must come to the conclusion that the Party leadership was somewhat remote from the country and from the real movement of the toiling masses. Certain consequences of living abroad are to be felt. Certain Parties in the Comintern have already passed through this.

Let us attempt to approach the situation in Germany with complete objectivity, without leaving the correct Marxist line given to us by Comrade Dimitroff at the Seventh Congress, namely, to speak of what corresponds to reality, and only that.

When the fascists came to power, the opinion prevailed for a certain time that the fascist dictatorship could not last long. People expected the speedy collapse of the fascist regime. There was too much talk of an early catastrophe.

Almost three years have passed since that time. The fascist dictatorship has passed through great convulsions. Where are its points of support, wherein does its strength still lie? It would be a great mistake to imagine that the fascist dictatorship in the main rests only on terror. Of course terror plays a very big role in solving a number of problems which face the fascists. It is possible that this role will even increase. But terror does not constitute the only source of the strength of the fascist regime.

Wherein lies the chief source of the strength of the fascist dictatorship in Germany?

1. In the last three years German fascism has succeeded in utilizing the contradictions in the camp of the international bourgeoisie, creating the impression among the masses that it has solved the international problems facing Germany. Fascism has thereby created a spirit of national self-satisfaction, especially among wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie. "Germany has once again become a great power," say the fascists. On the basis of this propaganda, they still hold back the masses who continue to have an unclear understanding of who has paid and who must pay for the fact that Germany has assumed the position of a great power; these are people who still do not see that the policy of German fascism is not a policy for solving the national problems of Germany, but a policy driving to war. With the aid of this national propaganda, fascism has succeeded in preserving

its influence over wide sections of the petty bourgeoisie, in checking the rapid development of the contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and what is especially important, has succeeded in winning the sympathy of a considerable section of the army, and thereby of toning down one of the most dangerous contradictions facing the fascist dictatorship.

2. Fascism has made use of the fact that it came to power in the period when the lowest point of the crisis had been passed, and when the transition was made to the special kind of depression. It has attempted with the aid of the state to bring about a good economic situation (armaments, subsidies, a policy in relation to raw materials, provision of work, etc.). A certain decline in the number of unemployed, and the fact that certain categories of employed workers, especially those engaged in the war industry, are receiving better wages, and the fact that no general reduction of nominal wages has taken place up till now, all these points must be examined in connection with this situation.

3. The fascist dictatorship has destroyed all political parties, all the independent organizations of the working class and toilers generally, and at the same time it has succeeded in establishing its own mass organizations which at the present time embrace and control millions of toilers.

4. Up to now there has been no solid anti-fascist opposition. The various groups within the anti-fascist opposition have not up till now attempted to unite on the basis of a common political platform. Fascism has succeeded in defeating them one by one, and thereby in strengthening its domination.

5. Finally we must also recognize that the internal difficulties in the Party leadership so weakened our Party that it has not succeeded in making political use of all its forces so as to defeat the enemy, and fulfil its proper role of developing all the sources of the anti-fascist opposition and of mustering all the anti-fascist forces, thereby establishing the pre-conditions for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

All these facts by no means imply that the dictatorship of German National-Socialism is a firm dictatorship. On the contrary. We must take account of the real sources of the strength of the dictatorship and its demagogy, if we wish to give our entire Party a correct political line. Every comrade and every Party functionary must be convinced that general phrases about radicalization, the activization of the masses, etc., will help him far less in his concrete struggle than an exact study of the sources of the strength of the fascist government and the movements taking place in the fascist camp.

> "Such an enemy," said Comrade Dimitroff, "must be known to perfection, from every angle. We must without any delay whatever react to his various maneuvers, discover his hidden moves, be prepared to repel him in any arena and at any moment. We must not hesitate even to learn from the enemy if that will help us more quickly and more effectively to wring his neck." *

* Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front Against Fascism and War*, p. 95. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

From what point are the difficulties arising at the present time for the fascist regime?

1. The so-called national policy of National-Socialism in reality, as I have already stated, is an imperialist policy directly driving to war. In Germany there are wide masses of the population who have not forgotten the last imperialist war and who do not want a new war; there are also elements among the bourgeoisie who are justly afraid that Hitler's foreign policy is driving the German people to a new catastrophe like that of 1918.

2. The fascists have counted on the economic depression passing rapidly into a boom, in Germany and on a world scale; in case of such a rapid change, the so-called state economic situation would change relatively painlessly under the influence of the internal economic forces of capitalism. This boom has not come about, and in the middle of 1935 a new change began within German capitalism in the direction of sharpening a whole number of difficulties, mutually connected as links in one and the same chain. The fluctuation of fascist economic policy between prices and wages, between price increases and reductions, between the limitation and expansion of production, especially in the war industry, between subsidies for the big manufacturers and big landowners and demagogic promises to the masses, between an intensified policy of autarchy and the limitation of imports, is becoming more intense. The search for means to improve the state economic situation comes up against definite limits. Private economic activity remains weak. Where are the means to be taken to cover the colossal expenditure on armaments? Primarily, these means are procured at the price of robbing the masses. In comparison with the growth of the number of employed workers, the increase in the payrolls is considerably lagging behind. But this is not all. It would be possible to modify these difficulties to a certain degree by slowing down the pace at which armaments are growing, or by intensifying the attack on wages and the standard of living of the masses. But the harvest in its turn has been a bad one. Prices continue to rise. Fascism feels that it is not in a position at one and the same time to increase prices and to bring about a general and open reduction of wages. It stands to reason that it is striving to bring about an increased offensive on wages. But the standard of living of the masses has already fallen to such a degree, that the fascists hesitate to openly and rapidly set about fulfilling this plan.

3. On the basis of these economic contradictions, which will come more and more to the forefront, the contradictions in the bourgeois camp are becoming intensified. A section of the bourgeoisie is attempting to cast the expenses of the fascist economic policy not only onto the backs of the proletariat, by intensifying the exploitation of the latter, but also onto the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, by increasing the pressure on them, and also onto the backs of other sections of the bourgeoisie. Other sections of the bourgeoisie are trembling in fear of the collapse of the entire internal and external policy of the fascists. Hence their opposition. Finally, there are leading groups among the bour-

geoisie, the Reichswehr for instance, who in spite of the growth of their prestige as a result of the fascist policy, in spite of the fact they are advancing hand in hand with fascism in the sphere of war policy, are nonetheless somewhat afraid of war in view of the discontent of the masses of the workers. The old contradictions of an economic, political and ideological character within the ranks of the German bourgeoisie have once again been revived, namely, between the industrial capitalists and landowners, between the kulaks and the big landlords, between the monopoly and non-monopoly capitalists, between the advanced capitalist West on the one hand and the East with its extensive economy on the other hand, between the Catholic population and the National-Socialist apparatus which is preponderately Protestant, etc. All this must directly or indirectly reflect itself in the political life of the country and create special difficulties for the fascist dictatorship.

4. The mass basis of the fascist dictatorship is not homogeneous. At the present time under the pressure of economic difficulties and the sharpening of the contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie, this diverse character of the mass basis of the dictatorship is especially to be marked. An important fact here is that a beginning has been made in introducing a cleavage between the masses of the peasants and the fascist dictatorship. The shortage of food supplies is very likely the result to a certain degree of the organized resistance of the peasants to fascist legislation. The following fact is not without importance, namely, that in Silesia things went so far as the arrest of a number of Junkers; that the opposition of the Steel Helmets at the present time is fundamentally the opposition of the peasants led by certain sections of the old government bureaucracy. In spite of the demagogic staging of the Nuremberg Congress the central problem facing it was the danger of the degeneration of the mass basis of fascism. Hence the so-called sharpening of the line of the party, which was the central slogan at Nuremberg. But what is the meaning in the present situation of the sharpening of the course of the fascist party? No concrete and positive promises were made to the masses. Social demagogy must now be limited to anti-Semitism, baiting of small shopkeepers, campaigns against Catholics, etc. The fascists are giving up concrete demagogic material promises. This is insufficient for the solution of the practical problems facing fascism. Hence we must come to the conclusion that the sharpening of the course of the fascist party must mean, according to the plan of the fascist leaders, an intensification of the role of their mass organizations in the system of the fascist dictatorship. It depends first and foremost on us, on the organized action of the advanced guard of the working class, whether fascism will fail in fulfilling these plans.

5. It is sufficient to call to mind that, as Comrade Dimitroff stated at the Seventh World Congress, fascism in spite of all its efforts has not succeeded in politically winning the main masses of the working class to its side. The contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie are and continue to remain of a most profound and principle character. But although we note the beginning of the activization of

the working class, we are at the same time compelled to issue a note of warning to all our comrades. It is true that in the enterprises, especially in the Ruhr region, there have been a number of inconsiderable spontaneous and semi-spontaneous mass protests. But this is only the beginning. What is characteristic in this respect is that the working class is not succeeding in linking up these small movements, and in coming forward before the entire people as the leading and decisive force in the anti-fascist opposition. After this developing activity which has been observed since the time of the elections to the "confidence councils" the movement has hardly made further successes, and this above all reveals the fact that our Party has by no means played the leading role which it should have played.

What are the main political and tactical tasks arising in this situation?

However sharp the contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie, they do not lead to the automatic collapse of the fascist dictatorship. The task facing the Party is, on the one hand, to arouse the discontent of the masses and to urge them on, and thus, as a result of the pressure of the masses, to intensify the waverings of the upper sections of society, to urge new elements into the ranks of the opposition, and to sharpen all the contradictions in the camp of the enemy. On the other hand, our task is to utilize the waverings among the various sections of the bourgeoisie and the antagonisms between them in order to extend the mass movement. Our task consists first and foremost in doing everything possible to unite the various elements, groups, and sections of the opposition, and to develop a wide, consolidated, and organized front of resistance against fascism. We must especially develop and organize the opposition and the movement that is beginning among the peasantry. We must endeavor to drive a wedge between the army and the fascist dictatorship. In Germany and abroad there is an anti-fascist opposition consisting of the remnants of the old democratic and anti-fascist parties. There is a new opposition in Germany growing out of the fascist organizations themselves, from among all sections of the population who have hitherto been and who partly are still under the influence of National-Socialism, and who are not engaged in a struggle against the fascist dictatorship as a whole, but only against certain measures operated by it. Both these big opposition trends must be brought into a coordinated movement against fascism. Only the working class, only the Communist Party can raise and solve this task.

The following are the first steps which must be made in the direction of solving this question. The sectarian mistakes of the Party in its attitude towards Social-Democracy must be overcome; the united front with the Social-Democratic organizations and the S.P.G. must be established; the Party must take an active part in re-establishing the free trade unions; a beginning must be made in penetrating the fascist "Labor Front", and the fascist sports, youth, women's and other organizations. But the Party must boldly and determinedly go further in this direction, without being afraid of coming into contact with such elements as for instance the supporters of Bruening.

These, comrades, in a compressed form are the main tasks of our policy on the united front and the people's front in Germany. I will not say anything about various problems connected with this policy, as, for instance, our attitude to the Catholic opposition, our policy in the countryside, etc. Both reporters have already spoken in detail about this. But here our policy regarding the united front and the people's front is linked up with a correct understanding of the tactics of the "Trojan horse", *i.e.*, the tactics of penetrating politically and organizationally into the fascist mass organizations on the basis of utilizing all legal possibilities for work.

In connection with this complex of questions, we wish to stress before your conference the following two main points:

The first point refers to the need for rallying all the forces of the Party for organizing the struggle for the immediate interests of the working class and all sections of the population. At the present time this is the starting point for all our political activity. Statements have been made here connected with the question of the people's front, and in connection with the perspective of the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, especially regarding a government of the people's front. The discussion of this question is useful, but we must in this respect warn our comrades against any schematic repetition and application of the line of the Seventh World Congress. The situation in Germany is not to be compared with the situation in France. A situation may also arise in Germany when the slogan of a government of the people's front will face the Party as a concrete and immediate slogan. But how shall we arrive at this situation? This is the problem that faces you today. The fascist dictatorship can only be overthrown by a broad mass movement, and the main task of the day is the organization of this movement. It is for this reason that the struggle of the Party for the immediate interests of all sections of the population on the basis of the smallest demands acquires such great importance. But how are we to explain the fact that only a few of the comrades who have spoken took as their starting point a concrete analysis of the conditions of the working class, of the peasants, small shopkeepers, etc., in their respective districts? But this is a sign of weak contacts between the Party and the masses. If these contacts are to be strengthened, it is necessary that all the active Party forces and all the members of the Party should be educated in a new spirit, not as propagandists of Communism, but as comrades who would be able quickly, independently, and on their own initiative to express their opinion on any question of interest to the masses, and to elaborate the slogans which fully correspond to the degree of the discontent of the masses and the level reached by the movement.

The Party press still does not play the role in this sphere which it ought to play. In spite of the improvements achieved in recent months, the *Rote Fahne* is still insufficiently linked up with the situation in Germany. It does not sufficiently assist the comrades there to advance the proper slogans. Those workers who openly declared, in their

letter to the editorial board of the *Rote Fahne*, that they would like the paper to feature more the everyday questions are perfectly correct. The *Rote Fahne* must not be a paper for the well-trained members of the Party, but a popular newspaper which would show to the rank-and-file worker who happens to get hold of our paper, even if but one issue, the way to carry on the day-to-day struggle in the fascist organizations. The language of our entire Party agitation must be adapted to the task of organizing and leading the mass movements in the fascist organizations.

The second main point which we would like to stress concerns the need for pursuing tactics and a policy which lead to the unification of all anti-fascist forces. How can we link up the opposition of the Social-Democratic workers with the peasant opposition, the opposition developing among the peasantry with the democratic group among the bourgeoisie? This can only be done if we work out a concrete political platform in which the interests and strivings of all these varied groupings are taken into account. As long as such a platform is not worked out, the question of the people's front will continue to a certain degree to hang in the air, and the danger arises that the elements of the anti-fascist opposition residing abroad will lose contact with the country, and urge our Party on the false path of working out a political program for a future government. The task of working out such a concrete political platform of the anti-fascist people's front is one of the most difficult tasks facing our conference.

As regards the contents of the platform, every individual concrete political slogan must be thoroughly weighed. These political slogans should be formulated in such a way that they reach the widest sections of the masses of the people, so that they combine the most urgent problems of the everyday struggle, with a view to carrying on a conscious political struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. These slogans must flow from the promises made by the fascists themselves, and also from the internal and external situation in Germany.

The first main slogan must be: *Against the war policy, which is leading to a new defeat for Germany.*

The program of national and social liberation which was advanced by the Party in the past is now out of date. It served the aim of popularizing the program of Soviet power in Germany, in general. But the main task is to expose the nationalist demagogy of fascism. Therefore we must drive, first and foremost, against the war policy, which is leading Germany to a new defeat. This general slogan must now be linked up with the slogan of the annulment of the Versailles Treaty.

Hence the following slogans: *For the complete annulment of the Versailles Treaty. For the unification of all Germans, not through war but on a voluntary basis and by international agreement.*

The absolutely concrete slogan of the *abolition of the Polish corridor by the same means* may also be put forward.

By widely popularizing these slogans, and by developing a real

mass struggle to secure the fulfilment of these slogans, we can disarm the nationalist demagogy.

In this connection, there is the slogan: *Re-establish agreement with the U.S.S.R., close economic contacts with the U.S.S.R., and the re-establishment of normal economic contacts with all countries.*

All these slogans touch on the national problems, and the problems of the foreign policy of fascism.

Then follow the main political slogans, especially the following: *Re-establish all democratic rights. Re-establish all political parties, and workers' and peasants' organizations; cleanse the army and the state apparatus from fascist elements,* especially those occupying privileged positions. *Freedom of conscience and religious faith. Equality of all citizens, regardless of their nationality and religion. Liberation of all anti-fascists and of all those imprisoned for violating fascist laws directed against the people.*

As regards economic demands, the following must be advanced:

Against the policy of autarchy, against compulsory economy and subsidies for the big capitalists at the expense of the wide masses of the people. Hence, for instance, there follow the following slogans:

For the free sale of the products of peasant labor. Down with the policy of autarchy. A merciless struggle to be conducted against the banks and the big speculators, who are raking in big profits at the expense of the consumer.

The complete restoration of social insurance and the return of all subsidies provided to the big industrialists and agrarians.

It is clear that all the points of such a program must be closely linked up with the general slogan *of the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.* But this slogan must be concretized by demanding that *those who are to blame for the catastrophe which is threatening the German people must be brought before the courts.* At the same time we must declare that *members of the lower fascist organizations who have been duped by the leading elements be given complete amnesty.* In this respect it must be stated that these slogans must be formulated in such a way that the anti-fascist struggle is linked up in them with the efforts of those elements who are not yet open anti-fascists, but whose interests are affected by the measures of the fascist dictatorship.

Comrades, these demands can only mean a first attempt to work out a platform of the anti-fascist people's front in Germany. The final editing of such a program with which we must appeal to all the anti-fascist elements is the task facing the conference and the Central Committee of the Party. I would only like to show you that in this sphere the Party must itself find something new. And this can only be achieved by making an exact study of the entire experience of the struggle against fascism conducted by the Party and the masses themselves.

Comrades, the same defect which appeared when the political questions were discussed also appears in respect to the analysis of the organizational questions of the Party and its methods of work. Com-

rades made long statements about the Trojan horse, but the main essence of this question has not yet been fully and completely revealed. The relics of sectarianism and schematism still do not allow certain comrades to see clearly that the Party must display the same flexibility when raising organizational questions as when it raises and solves general political and tactical problems. One gets the impression that certain comrades imagine that in the sphere of organization only hard and fast principles exist, from which we must not retreat. This is incorrect, comrades.

At the Tenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party a resolution was adopted regarding Party structure, the first two paragraphs of which read as follows:

> "1. The Party of revolutionary Marxism rejects outright the idea of seeking a form of Party organization, or methods of work for such an organization, as would be absolutely correct and suitable for all stages of the revolutionary process. On the contrary, the form of organization and methods of work are entirely determined by the peculiarities of the given concrete historical situation and the tasks which directly flow from this situation.
>
> "2. From this point of view it can be understood that every organizational form, and the methods of work that correspond to it, may, if the objective conditions of the development of the revolution change, become transformed from forms facilitating the development of the Party organization into fetters of this development. And vice versa, an organizational form which has been rendered useless may become necessary and the only expedient form in case the corresponding conditions come into being again."

I am convinced that these words do not require any commentary, and that all those who are present at this conference will understand how necessary it is for every member of the C.P. of Germany and of the Political Bureau to master this really Bolshevik organizational instruction in the present situation.

How can we apply the tactics of the Trojan horse, if under the fascist dictatorship we do not adapt the organizational forms of the Party in time and in their entirety to the conditions of underground work? Unless this adaptation takes place, the mass work of the Party and work in the mass fascist organizations is impossible.

In this connection it must be clearly understood that there is a great difference between the conditions in which the Bolshevik Party carried on its struggle during the tsarist regime, and the situation in which we have now to carry on the struggle under the fascist dictatorship.

These distinctions determine a whole series of the peculiarities in the methods and structure of the Party in its work.

1. The state apparatus which tsarism had at its disposal was far more primitive and weak than the apparatus at the disposal of fascism. Therefore it is easier for the fascists to destroy us than it was for the tsarist police. Therefore we in Germany as in Italy require such a

form of organization as will least lend itself to being reached by the state apparatus of fascism. Our organization must be in the greatest degree decentralized. If there is one committee at the head of a wide organization it will inevitably need to set up a tremendous apparatus for the fulfilment of its functions, and this is extremely dangerous for our entire organization in the present conditions.

2. The tsarist regime did not resort to social demagogy on a wide scale, and did not build up its own mass organizations, as has been done by the fascists, who by means of such organizations are attempting to muster wide sections of the toilers around themselves, and to secure control of them. Therefore we must recognize the methods of work of our enemies, and make use of this demagogy, make it the starting point of our activity, and build our own mass and Party organization inside the organizations of the enemy themselves. The Bolsheviks under tsarism made use of all legal possibilities. The experience of the Bolsheviks has been of use not only to us, but the fascists have also learned something from it; they have learned to adopt special measures so as to more and more limit the legal possibilities for the work of our Party. Therefore with every change in the policy of fascism we must learn how to adapt the methods of work and the forms of organization of our Party to these changes. For instance, not always nor under all circumstances is it necessary to build our organization on the basis of factory nuclei.

3. The terror directed against us is far more intense than it was in tsarist times. There has not been up till now in the history of the working class movement an example of the mass application of such brutal terror with a view to destroying the vanguard of the working class. We must therefore take special measures to safeguard and protect our cadres. We cannot insist on the necessity of collective work by the Party bodies if experience shows that this would place the organization under the threat of destruction. If the construction of our organization on the basis of a more elastic system of contacts provides us with a better guarantee for the safeguarding of our old cadres and of the work of our organizations, then we must not hesitate to adopt this system. In connection with the new conditions of work we must check the special policy of cadres, by taking measures to safeguard the old Party cadres and to establish new ones.

Thanks to such alterations, our Party organizations will be able to achieve tremendous mobility and to display exceptional initiative. Finally, we must note that although very much needs to be done in this sphere, very little must be said about it especially in public. Not all the experience of the organization of the Party needs to be given publicity, and in respect to mass movements also special forms need to be discovered for giving comrades and the masses correct leadership, without revealing our plans and methods of work to our enemies.

Comrades, prior to the advent of the fascist dictatorship our Party had more than 200,000 members. What a force we would represent now in Germany if we had even one-fifth or one-sixth of this number cor-

rectly organized and politically active. But if it is a question of only tens of thousands then all the more important is the question of correctly setting the Communists to work. We are convinced that the Party at the present moment has forces, which, if correctly utilized, could be a serious menace to the fascist dictatorship. The Party has sufficient forces which by their work can exert decisive influence over the development of the entire situation in Germany, it has sufficient forces to deal heavy blows at fascism. But this will only be possible if the forces of the Party are correctly utilized, and the latter is only possible if a radical change is made in all the methods of work of our Party. A decisive point has been reached for bringing about this turn. The German Party has already accumulated sufficient experience to understand that further delay in solving these questions may place it in an extremely difficult situation.

Nearly every comrade who has spoken in the discussion dwelt on the question of the Party leadership. Unless there is firm unity in the leadership of the Party, it is impossible to solve the problems facing you. The greater the flexibility, boldness and far-sightedness required in the solution of Party questions, all the stronger and more steeled must the Party leadership be. If Comrade Thaelmann were with you it would be easy to solve this task, for he himself carried on a merciless struggle against sectarianism. We shall support all comrades who have taken a step along the road to liberation from sectarianism and schematism. We shall help them since we desire a concentration of all the forces of the Party. The concentration of all the forces of the Party, and collective leadership, cannot be the result of arithmetical calculation. It can only be the result of a united and determined struggle to carry through a single political line.

This line, comrades, was given to you by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

Don't forget, comrades! Unless you assemble all the anti-fascist forces, there can be no victory over fascism.

Without a firm proletarian united front, it will be impossible to rally the anti-fascist front of the German people.

Without a firm Bolshevik Party, there can be no proletarian unity!

Without an iron collective leadership there can be no firm Bolshevik Party!

We have been told this by the masters of revolutionary policy, Lenin and Stalin.

Long live the Communist Party of Germany, the organizer of the victory of the German people over fascism! (*Stormy and prolonged applause. Delegates sing the "International".*)

You Cannot Sit Between Two Stools

By K. GOTTWALD

A CERTAIN Mr. Souvarine, a Trotskyite, has published in Paris a disgraceful, Trotskyite, counter-revolutionary pamphlet, attacking Comrade Stalin and the Soviet Union. This in itself is nothing special, for it is part of the profession of the Trotskyite agents of counter-revolution. What is noteworthy, however, is that Otto Bauer has taken up the attack. In the October issue of the journal *Kampf*, Otto Bauer wrote an article about Souvarine's pamphlet. In this article Bauer not only publicizes all the Trotskyist infamies, he adds his own "theoretical reasons", and draws his own political conclusions.

What is the essence of Bauer's article? First, Otto Bauer asserts that the Soviet Union is under "the personal dictatorship of Stalin". He admits that he took up Souvarine's pamphlet with great curiosity, hoping to obtain information about the "personality of the dictator". Further, Bauer relates the contents of Souvarine's scurrilous lampoon, and does this in such a way that it is difficult to decide where he, Bauer, is voicing his own mind and where he is dishing out Souvarine. You get the impression, however, that it is Bauer speaking. Third, Otto Bauer dares to assert that out of factional considerations, the Bolsheviks falsify the history of the revolution. However, to give an impression of "objectivity", he adds that this method is used not only by "official historians of the Soviet Union", but also by "Stalin's defeated opponents". Fourth, Bauer "criticizes" Souvarine.

It would seem that Souvarine is not right when he puts the "development of the dictatorship" down simply to "Stalin's love of power". With his usual "objectivity", Bauer grants Stalin certain abilities, concedes that he is of definite importance, the more so since the Soviet Union, under Stalin's guidance, has secured notable achievements in all spheres. Thus a mouse could be similarly "objective" in apprising the height of a mountain. But Bauer hastens to declare that though he "recognizes" the work of Stalin, it by no means implies that he—Bauer—approves of all that has taken and is taking place in the U.S.S.R. On the contrary, there is much that he does not like. If, "on the one hand", he recognizes the positive sides of the Soviet Union, it is apparently mainly in order, "on the other hand", to give the Soviet Union some "sound advice". It is with surprise that we ask ourselves what sort of advice Otto Bauer, who so thoroughly wrecked the Austrian revolution, can offer to the Soviet Union and its victorious proletariat. It appears that Bauer asks for no more nor less than the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, and he wants, in this connection, to bring pressure to bear upon the Soviet Union by organizing "strong Socialist public opinion". His Trotskyite, counter-revolutionary hoof is herein revealed in all its unsightliness. Finally, Otto

Bauer gives a complete amnesty to Souvarine, asserting that all of the latter's foul attacks against Comrade Stalin are actually only a reaction against ". . . the deification of Stalin by his (Stalin's) supporters". Thus, according to Bauer, the people to be condemned are the proletarians who surround their great leader with the respect and love he deserves, and not the foul libertine who is in the service of the class enemy.

To defend Comrade Stalin against an insignificant Trotskyist like Souvarine would be to insult Stalin. Nor is Otto Bauer the sort of person against whom it is necessary in any degree to defend Stalin. But of late Otto Bauer has been passing himself off as a "friend of the Soviet Union". And what is more, he has begun to present himself as a supporter of the united working class front, to recommend himself as an "honest broker" serving the Socialist and Communist Internationals. If Otto Bauer thinks he is serving the proletariat by lighting a candle to God "on the one hand" and a candle to the devil "on the other", he is mistaken. What is more, he is not even helping himself by doing so. The real friends of the Soviet Union and the real supporters of the united front can permit no ambiguity on this question. For this reason we are compelled to throw some light on the last tidbit of Otto Bauer.

* * *

The excerpts already given show that Bauer uses arguments borrowed from the Trotskyite arsenal with which to attack. In one part of his article he even takes it upon himself to defend Trotsky personally. Perhaps Bauer would ask us with surprise: and what is there strange in that? If Bauer himself does not know it, we must explain to him that in the eyes of every honest proletarian, association with Trotsky and Trotskyism is extremely *compromising*. If Otto Bauer were in the Soviet Union, he would discover what the Soviet workers and collective farmers think of such association. Incidentally, it is enough to acquaint him with the opinions held by revolutionary workers in capitalist countries on this subject. They do not differ in any way from the opinion of the toilers of the Soviet Union. All that is honest and sincere in the working class avoids Trotskyism like the plague, for Trotskyism is an agency of international counter-revolution, in the real sense of the word. Trotskyism is a foul, vile, criminal enemy of the working class movement. Trotskyism is a counter-revolutionary cesspool, out of which the murderer of Comrade Kirov came forth.

What, in the present situation, are the tasks facing Trotskyism? How is its counter-revolutionary character, so hostile to the working class of the whole world, expressed? First, the bourgeoisie have entrusted Trotskyism with the task of discrediting the Soviet Union in every possible way. There is no calumny against the U.S.S.R. that has not been concocted in the Trotskyist kitchen. Trotsky supplies all the "theoretical" and "special" material for the unbridled anti-Soviet campaign conducted by Goebbels and Hitler.

Second, Trotskyism supplies the world bourgeoisie with arguments

for their struggle against world Communism. There is not a single anti-Communist campaign which, in one form or another, is not based on the anti-Communist calumnies, distortions, and "theories" of the Trotskyites.

Third, the bourgeoisie have entrusted Trotskyism with the task of disorganizing the working class movement, of undermining the desire of the working class for unity, and of maintaining the split in the ranks of the proletariat. Wherever a Trotskyite appears in the ranks of the working class he sows demoralization and strife.

Fourth, in the service of the bourgeoisie, Trotskyism endeavors to lead certain sections of the working class on to the road of counter-revolution. Left tendencies are gathering strength in the ranks of the international working class movement. By using "Left" phrases and "theories" Trotskyism is endeavoring to get a hold upon these tendencies and direct them into counter-revolutionary channels.

Fifth, in many countries Trotskyism has become a direct branch of the police and supplies the latter with numerous agents provocateurs and spies to fight against the revolutionary movement.

These are the reasons why we are perfectly justified in calling Trotskyism an agency of counter-revolution. This is why all that is honest and sincere in the ranks of the working class avoids Trotskyism like the plague. These are the reasons why association with Trotskyism is extremely compromising in the eyes of every honest worker.

The "naive" Otto Bauer may perhaps tell us that there are many in the ranks of Social-Democracy who do not agree with all that takes place in the Soviet Union and who do not recognize Communist theory and practice. That is why they are Social-Democrats. And yet you want to set up a united front with them, while you fight so passionately against the Trotskyites, although they are former Communists! We can clear this up for Otto Bauer. Quite right. Many honest Social-Democratic workers are full of superstitions, nebulous ideas and reservations concerning the Soviet Union and Communism. But they are moving *Leftwards, they are coming closer* to the Soviet Union and Communism. Obviously, the process is going on slowly, with difficulty, overcoming obstacles, in zig-zag fashion. But on the whole they are moving in a direction which corresponds to the interests of the working class. We engage in patient and friendly discussion with such people. We try to convince them, and help them to find the right road. But whereas the Social-Democratic worker is developing *Leftward*, in the direction of Communism, Trotskyism has "developed" *Rightward*, has fallen *into the slough of counter-revolution*, and is sinking deeper and deeper into it. Is it not clear that in such a situation it is a mistake, to put it mildly, to regard Trotskyism as part of the *working class movement?* Is it not clear that anyone who is found in the neighborhood of Trotskyism, is open, whether he wants it or not, to the danger of being lost forever to the working class cause? Is it not clear that Otto Bauer, in his own interests, ought to ponder this question very seriously?

* * *

As for Otto Bauer's *attitude to the Soviet Union*, he would like to do things in a manner most convenient to himself. He is graciously prepared to "recognize" all that the whole world has already recognized, and at the same time condescendingly to "make reservations" against everything that is not yet clear to the entire world. We are deeply grateful for this sort of "friendship". And yet Otto Bauer ought to know that one of the most important criteria as to which way anybody is going is his attitude to the Soviet Union. The workers today demand a clear, unambiguous, unconditional and *positive* attitude towards the U.S.S.R. I repeat: clear, unambiguous, *unconditional*, positive. They want no juggling with "on the one hand" and "on the other hand". But this is just the method used by Otto Bauer and those who hold his views. "On the one hand", we have to recognize that Stalin is "greater than we imagined", but "on the other hand" Trotsky is also "a hero of the proletarian revolution". "On the one hand" we must express our admiration at Stalin's work, but "on the other hand"—"the fact that we go thus on record cannot and must not serve as an apology for all that has been done or is being done in the Soviet Union and for which Stalin is responsible". "On the one hand", the dictatorship was essential for the victory of the revolution and Socialism, but "on the other hand"—"the cruel necessity of the revolutionary coup d'etat can on no account justify *all* the cruelties of the dictatorship". "On the one hand"—"terror is justified historically", but alas, "on the other hand",—don't step on the corns of the counter-revolutionaries, and please explain why you meted out such cruel punishment to the murderers of Kirov. "On the one hand", Souvarine stacks up all that Stalin's enemies have ever said against him, including all kinds of gossip that could never be proved, but "on the other hand"—"many interesting details, many humorous ideas and many pointed analogies can be found in Souvarine's book. . . ." Enough. There must be an end to all such tricks, Otto Bauer. If you are so narrow-minded on this question, and have not yet arrived at the logical conclusions yourself, then allow us to tell you the following:

The October revolution was one indivisible whole. The victory of the proletariat over one-sixth of the globe was one indivisible whole. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an indivisible whole. The industrialization of the Soviet Union, the first and second Five-Year Plans, collectivization of agriculture, the abolition of unemployment, the rapid rise of the cultural level of the masses, the road to well-being, to a joyful life, the building of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.—all of this is one *indivisible* whole. The entire Soviet Union of today is one *indivisible* whole, the *indivisible* accomplishment of many millions and tens of millions carried out under the guidance of Lenin and Stalin. And this is how it must be taken, as *one indivisible whole*, and not eclectically on the lines of: "I like this and I don't like that."

If Otto Bauer had the slightest sense of proportion he would himself feel how miserable and ridiculous are his actions when he measures this magnificent work by his own petty-bourgeois dwarfish footrule. But this person argues in this way: the former, absolutely negative attitude

towards the Soviet Union can no longer be maintained. We must recognize some positive features. The more so since the U.S.S.R. has been recognized throughout the whole world, and the Social-Democratic workers would not permit of such an open manifestation of hostility towards the U.S.S.R. I must, therefore, act adroitly. What cannot be denied I recognize and praise, and pat the Bolsheviks in friendly fashion on the back, and, in consequence, acquire the right to pull everything else to bits as I like. I shall be "objective", my criticism will be all the weightier, and may the devil take me if I am not able to mislead the Social-Democratic workers, who today are so "uncritical" in their admiration of the Soviet Union. No, no, Otto Bauer! The Bolsheviks are too experienced to be deceived by such naive argumentation! And I think that the Social-Democratic workers, too, will not allow themselves to be misled.

* * *

In the political conclusions he draws in this article, Otto Bauer adopts an openly hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union. He demands no more and no less than that the U.S.S.R. "be subjected to the pressure of strong Socialist public opinion". For what purpose? So that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. which Otto Bauer pictures as a "terrorist dictatorship", should be abolished. Moreover, he gives vent to the following harangue:

> "The economic development of the Soviet Union has already passed through the most dangerous phase. The terrorist dictatorship has already achieved the greater part of the work it was called upon to achieve, terrorist violence has to a great extent fulfilled its historic function. Now, if they want the revolution to attain its aim of building up the socialist society, the terror can and must be diminished step by step, and violence must be abolished as it gradually becomes no longer necessary to defend the social gains of the revolution."

Listen, Otto Bauer! That the Soviet Union has left its most difficult period behind, that the Soviet Union has solved the question as to "Who will win", that the U.S.S.R. stands out firm as a rock among the turbulent waves of the capitalist chaos—for all this, *you* are not in the least to blame. Over the course of many years you have constantly added fuel to the fire on which the international counter-revolution would have burned the Soviet Union with the greatest of joy. Over the course of many years you have used every means at your disposal to besmirch the Soviet Union, and marched side by side with the entire army of all the other calumniators. If all your anti-Soviet exhortations had any material force, you would have caused the Soviet Union serious harm. In addition, you have caused much harm to the international working class movement by guiding the class consciousness of the workers and toiling masses of the capitalist countries along the wrong road. No, you can claim no credit for the fact that the Soviet Union today is so strong and mighty. The Soviet Union arose, grew up and gathered strength

in the struggle *against* you and enemies of all shades. How can you dare to offer the advice to the Soviet Union, which has become so strong and mighty in spite of your hatred towards it, that it should abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat, *i.e.*, that it should disarm? Take a good look at this sage! To begin with, he sneers at the dictatorship of the proletariat, he exhorted that it must perish through its inability to solve the political, social and economic problems in its country. The world, however, did not develop according to his notions, but according to its own laws, and things turned out quite differently from what this good fellow prophesied. But he is not in the least embarrassed. He shakes himself like a wet poodle, and goes at it from the other end: the dear dictatorship of the proletariat has finished its work, now it can go! The Soviet Union, however, has no need of such "advice".

That is one side of the question. Concerning the other side, just a word in passing.

There is a proletariat that has paid heavily for heeding Otto Bauer —the Austrian proletariat, whose revolution Otto Bauer has buried so successfully. But Otto Bauer should not waste any effort. He will not succeed in burying the revolution of the *Soviet* proletariat.

* * *

In conclusion, we must say frankly that it does not fit in to want to be an "honest broker" between the Communist and Socialist Internationals, and at the same time to spread about the poison of Trotskyism; the one excludes the other. Nor does it fit in to want to be an honest advocate of the united working class front and at the same time to bespatter the U.S.S.R. and Comrade Stalin—yes, Otto Bauer—Stalin. For as far as we Bolsheviks are concerned, Stalin and the U.S.S.R. are indissolubly bound together. Here again one thing excludes the other. To try to rehabilitate one's self politically in the eyes of the workers, and at the same time to swagger about in the company of the Trotskyites and the enemies of the Soviet Union—is to attempt the absolutely hopeless.

The General Elections in Great Britain

By HARRY POLLITT

THE recent General Election in Britain was the most *fateful for a very long period, and its results are also very serious.* The fact that the National Government could be returned with a majority far in excess of what its most optimistic supporters thought possible is a matter for the most thoughtful reflection and enquiry.

It is necessary to remember that the National Government had been the subject of real mass hatred. It had cut wages and unemployment benefits; introduced the Sedition Act and Part II of the Unemployment Act. It had increased expenditure on war services and reduced expenditure on vital social services; it had increased food prices through its tariff policy and Marketing Schemes; it had tightened its hold on subject peoples, as in India through the New Constitution, and even during the election it could permit itself to allow Sir Samuel Hoare to make threats to Egypt that immediately led to grave riots among the population of Egypt.

Yet such a Government is returned with a big majority, although much less than in 1931. *It is cold consolation to quote comparative figures with previous elections, or to speculate on how a different electoral system would have worked.* These are no answer to the political issues that are raised, as to why with such a favorable situation the Labor Party could not get another one to one and a half million votes from the Tories, which would have given it a Parliamentary majority, why the Tory Party in its masquerade of a National Government remained the strongest Party in Parliament although it lost 89 seats. Note in this connection also that during the early months of 1935, the mass movement against the Government rose to its peak in the tremendous struggle against the Unemployed Regulations, a struggle which compelled the Government to retreat.

The National Government undoubtedly improved its political position by its proposals to the last Budget, the concessions it made on the Unemployment Act, its restorations of wage cuts to State employees and especially by its Jubilee and national defense propaganda.

But the main causes of the election victory of the National Government are to be found in the policy pursued by the Labor Party.

First, the lack of a fighting program of even the immediate demands of the workers, that could mobilize the workers for mass struggle today.

Second, the Labor leaders identified themselves with the National Government's policy in regard to Ethiopia, without advancing their own demands and organizing independent action of the working class.

Third, the fact that the Labor leaders did not want a complete victory and the fact that for months no real fight had been made to win

power in the general election, and no effective popularization of the necessity of returning a Labor Government that would fight capitalism.

Fourth, the refusal to accept the repeated united front proposals made by the Communist Party.

Fifth, the differences in the Labor Party leadership on the question of sanctions, all their points of view not corresponding with the actual struggle for peace.

These are the principal reasons why the Labor Party failed to win the General Election. It also needs to be noted that there were many failures in places overwhelmingly proletarian in character, which everyone expected that Labor would win, such as Dundee, Wallsend, Sunderland, Greenock, Newcastle on Tyne, and certain seats in Birmingham and Lancashire. A distinguishing feature is that it is clear that in towns like Dundee, Sunderland, Wallsend, Greenock, Birmingham, the propaganda—"War Means Work"—had the effect of the National Government retaining its representatives by its proposals for re-armament.

At the same time we must also say that in these places the main influence and activity of the Communist Party was weak, along with a similar weakness of the Labor Party, for, where the Communist Party was strong and active in united efforts with the local Labor Party, even in centers of the war industry like Sheffield and certain constituencies on the Clyde, there Labor won seats and votes from the National Government.

It is also a serious situation that in places like Hulme, Salford, Rossendale, Blackburn and similar towns in Lancashire, Labor failed to win the seats it formerly held prior to the General Election of 1931. Here, in addition to the main causes already outlined, there were special causes connected with the policy pursued by Labor in the cotton industry and amongst the dockers.

The Communist Party in this General Election gave a *striking* demonstration of the correctness of the line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. We made a very big change in our election policy, that was completely justified by the events which followed.

The keynote of our policy was united action to defeat the National Government and return a Labor Government that would fight capitalism.

In my speech at the Seventh Congress I stated on behalf of the British delegation:

> "The Communist Party in its revolutionary agitation and propaganda amongst the workers must popularize its revolutionary program of Soviet power concretely applied to British conditions and industries as the *only way* in which all these basic problems can be solved and *bread, work and peace* guaranteed to the working population. . . .
>
> "But the principal political task of the Communist Party becomes clear. It is to stand out before every working man and woman in Britain as the initiator and leader of the fight to cause the defeat of the National Government, by the organization of a broad united front movement, based upon a program of demands that every worker really believes can and must be

carried through by a Labor Government, and which will strengthen the workers' immediate fight against capitalism, and, putting a brake upon the advance of fascism and war, will help the developments towards socialism."

And Comrade Dimitroff in his Report on "The Fight for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism", when he referred to this position of the Communist Party, stated:

"This position of the British Communists is a correct one. It will help them to set up a militant united front with the millions of members of the British trade unions, and the British Labor Party.

"While always remaining in the front ranks of the fighting proletariat, and pointing out to the masses the only right path—the path of the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a Soviet Government—the Communists, in defining their immediate political aims, must not attempt to leap over those necessary stages of the mass movement in the course of which the working class masses by their own experience outlive their illusions and pass over to the side of Communism."

How deeply the masses resented any attempt to split the workers' vote was decisively demonstrated. For example, where labor contested against the previous sitting I.L.P. members of Parliament, like Maxton, McGovern, Buchanan, or I.L.P. ex-M.P.'s like Jowett and Jennie Lee, there the workers gave a crushing rebuff to the Labor Party candidate.

In places where the I.L.P. split the vote against the Labor Party, the same crushing rebuff was given to the candidates of the I.L.P.

In West Fife, Comrade Gallacher gained a magnificent victory for working class unity, over a Labor candidate who was responsible for the split in the miners' ranks in 1928, and who today is the chief opponent of unity of the miners' unions.

The active workers in the Labor movement all over Britain need to draw the necessary political lessons from such actions of the masses.

We ourselves did not give sufficient thought to this question or we would not have limited our support to only Maxton, McGovern, Buchanan and Cambell Stephen of the I.L.P. but would have extended it to such I.L.P. candidates connected with the working masses as Fred Jowett, Jennie Lee and also to W. J. Brown.

The Communist Party, immediately after the Seventh Congress and before a General Election was contemplated, had written to the Executive Committee of the Labor Party, proposing a joint meeting to consider how best to secure the defeat of the National Government, return a Labor Government and by an electoral pact, avoid any splitting of the workers' votes.

The Labor leaders refused to meet us on the grounds that it wasn't necessary to discuss anything with us. Despite this refusal, we went ahead with our mass campaign for unity and withdrew 18 of our can-

didates in places where a split would have meant the danger of a National Government representative being returned.

We made proposals in West Fife and Rhondda East to avoid any contest with the Labor Party there, and, on our proposals being rejected, were forced to fight in the interests of the working class themselves. The victory of Comrade Gallacher and the 13,653 votes received for myself proved the justification of our policy.

In all other places we instructed the locals of the Communist Party to make united front approaches for common action in the elections. It proved to be an amazing and instructive experience. Our policy met with a great response and success. We came closer to the rank and file workers in the Labor Party and trade unions than ever before in the history of the Communist Party.

It is true that in most cases the local Labor Party said that the help of the Communist Party would have to be unofficial as, according to their argument, it would otherwise bring them into conflict with their National Executive.

But the fact remains that in nearly every case where the united front, in any form, was established between the Communist Party and the Labor Party, the Labor candidate was either returned as a Member of Parliament or received a greatly increased vote at the same time as our Party members demonstrated their activity and energy in the carrying out of the tasks in the election campaign.

I have carefully read through over 50 reports from Communist locals and there is only one in which it is stated that a Labor man expressed the opinion that the support of the Communist Party for the Labor Party lost votes. In every other case the reverse tribute was paid either by the Labor candidate or his agent.

It will be interesting to give some extracts from these reports to show the effect of the united front in the various localities.

First, to prove how the barriers have been broken down between locals of the Communist Party and of the Labor Party:

> "In the last fortnight we have gone forward tremendously, never to go back. We have already plans in hand with regard to the local Peace Council and with the help of the Labor Party we shall be a force to be reckoned with locally." (*Southbend report.*)

> "In general, it can be said that throughout the area, relationship with Labor Party members was strengthened considerably and Party members participated well in all forms of activity.
>
> "There is for the first time a tendency to strike virile roots deep into the life of the working class, instead of scratching at the surface as hitherto." (*Thames Valley report.*)

> "Strong assistance, mainly canvassing, given by Party, and extremely cordial relations existing between Party members and rank and file Labor Party members and some officials." (*Twickenham and Hounslow report.*)

"Both our work in the municipal and general elections has enormously increased our prestige and resulted in breaking down the barrier between us and the Labor Party workers." (*Hull report.*)

"We created friendly relations with the members of the Labor Party and broke down many barriers that had been created, we worked well together which augurs well for the future." (*Great Harwood, Lancashire, report.*)

"We helped considerably, but what is better the Labor people themselves are saying this. A much better feeling between the two Parties exists, our prospects are better now than they have ever been, it only remains for us to drive whilst things are favorable." (*Blythe report, Newcastle.*)

"Our work in the campaign has placed the Party on a much better footing with the Labor Party and the trade union movement than has ever existed before in Norwich." (*Norwich report.*)

"The impression among rank-and-file members of the Labor Party is very good. They welcomed this and agreed that we must all get together in order to fight against the capitalist offensive." (*Dowlais report.*)

"We have established excellent relations with the lower Labor Party officials. Both ward secretaries of the Labor Party thank the Party members." (*Edmonton, London, report.*)

"Our boys are working with the members of the Labor Party and so well are they working that they are being eagerly sought after now by the secretaries of other ward committees and other Labor candidates." (*Barnsley report.*)

"The Labor Party in the Mansfield Division have officially accepted the help of the new Communist local and good election meetings have been held at which our Party members spoke on behalf and *with* the Labor candidate, Charlie Brown." (*Mansfield, Notts, report.*)

"In Rawtenstall during the municipal election one ward was contested by a Labor Councillor, J. R. Ashworth, who had been expelled from the Labor Party on account of his association with the F.S.U.; in spite of the fact that he had no official backing from the Labor Party and was subjected to a campaign of misrepresentation by his Tory opponent (Communist bogey) he was re-elected with a much improved majority and polled the highest number of votes ever recorded for a Labor candidate in Rawtenstall, *viz.*, 1,224 against his Tory opponent's 884." (*Municipal Election report, Rawtenstall, Lancs.*)

". . . the President of the Trades Council openly at our meeting expressed his appreciation and full support for the Communist proposals for a united front to defeat the National Government." (*Long Eaton, Notts, report.*)

"The agent of the divisional Labor Party has visited our local at Hucknall, thanked them for their offer of assistance and the whole Party in the area is playing its part. . . ." (*Hucknall, Notts., report.*)

The following materials show how the importance of the united front and the work of the Communist Party were appreciated by a number of Labor candidates, both in the municipal and general elections.

Councillor King wrote the following to C.P. Organizer Hull:

"Will you please convey to your members my heartfelt thanks for the trojan efforts they made in assisting my candidature in Beverly Ward. I and my colleagues of the Labor Party are sorry that the united efforts of the gallant band of workers of both our Parties did not meet with the success they deserved. But we know at least that the fault was not with those who did the work.

"I am proud that the members of your Party put in such fine work on our behalf and hope that this may be the deciding factor when the question of a united workers' movement is again discussed."

James C. Walsh, Labor M.P., Bothwell, declared the following:

"How we won in Bothwell is easy to answer. We won because there was such unity in all sections of the movement as has seldom been experienced in the history of Labor election campaigns."

Thomas Kennedy, Labor M.P., Kirkcaldy, declared that:

"On our side, I am glad and proud to say, we had a real united front. We had large enthusiastic meetings in all parts of the division, and an almost monotonous absence of any opposition. . . ."

James McCullock, Labor candidate, Hillhead, Glasgow, wrote the following to the C.P. Organizer:

"Before leaving Glasgow I would like to thank you and through you all the members of your organization who so willingly forgot any Party differences and joined in the fight against the common enemy.

"I regret that we did not achieve a larger measure of success not for myself, but for the masses in your area, who turned out to my aid.

"This end of the constituency is definitely ahead and I fear to think what the majority would have been, but for the time and energy you mobilized at Partick."

Edgar P. Young, Labor candidate, North-West Hull, wrote the following:

"I wish to express to you and through you to all those other members of the Communist Party who have been working on

my behalf during the general election, my sincere gratitude for the very great effort you have made throughout the campaign. Your energy and enthusiasm have been a source of inspiration and encouragement to me and to the workers of the North-West Hull Labor Party.

"It is certain that the progress we have registered is very largely due to the unity and militancy of our 'people's front', and I sincerely hope that a continuation of the friendly relations established during the past campaign will enable that progress to be consolidated and extended. . . ."

"The Chairman of the Labor Party personally congratulated the Communist Party on their work during the election campaign not as individuals but as a Party, which was cheered to the echo by all present." (*Southend report.*)

"On the last day of the campaign the Conservative candidate came out with an 'Election Special' full of scares and lies. The Labor Party had nothing to offer in reply—in fact they were in a wild state of panic. But the Party was quickly on the job and within a couple of hours every house that had the Conservatives' 'Election Special' had also a copy of 'To the Polls'. The Labor Party were very impressed by this and as one member put it to me, 'I honestly don't know what we would have done without you Communists; I was never so relieved in all my life when I saw your bulletin come through my door'."

(*Edmonton, London, report.*)

"The Sub-Agent on numerous occasions commented on the help of the C.P. and hoped we would work together in the future, and has personally stated that we have been a great help. The candidate thanked the Party for its help and the comrades personally." (*Great Harwood, Lancs., report.*)

"Indeed it is hardly necessary for me to say that this Divisional Labor Party Election Committee welcomes the valuable assistance of the local Communist Party in joining with us in united effort to return a representative of the working classes to Parliament." (*Extract from letter from Labor Election Agent to C.P. Group, Vale of Leven local.*)

So we could go on, making quotation after quotation from reports covering the whole country, proving how the Communist Party played a real political role in leading the fight for united action against the National Government. In the London area, in 57 cases of 62, a united front existed between the Communist Party and the Labor Party, although Herbert Morrisson and one or two other similar-minded gentlemen refused our assistance.

Naturally, the Tory press came out full blast against the united front of Communists and Labor. All the hoary old stories about "Labor's Unholy Alliance with the Communists", "Labor Allied with Advocates of Civil War", etc., were revived.

We will quote a typical example from a Yorkshire Tory paper:

". . . What bargain has Labor made with the Communists?

The Communists are the friends of Russia, where a revolution was affected amid scenes that horrified the whole of civilization. . . ."

It is also interesting to note the type of Tory leaflet that was put out, to try and prevent united action between Communists and Labor workers. The following are extracts from a leaflet calling for support of the National candidates which was distributed in hundreds of thousands of copies, and readers will not fail to note the skilful use made to this end by the Tories of the anti-Communist attacks of the *Daily Herald* and the foul slander of Fenner Brockway, the Secretary of the I.L.P.:

"LABOR'S BASE SURRENDER

"In constituencies in all parts of the country Labor Party candidates are welcoming with open arms the help and support of the Communist Party at this election.

"Every day the *Daily Worker*, the Communist newspaper, published reports confirming the fact.

"What has become of the Labor Party's declaration that it stands for constitutional Parliamentary Government?

"Do they remember what the *Daily Herald* said as recently as August last:

" 'We find the sickening spectacle of Communists pretending they are really good little democrats after all. They ask for united action to protect democracy, which their faith commits them to overthrow at the first opportunity. They care nothing for democracy. But they have discovered it has one advantage over any dictatorship but their own. It protects their political skins.' (*Daily Herald*, August 17, 1935.)

"Yet now you find Labor candidates accepting the help of the Communist Party which openly stands for confiscation of property, armed revolution and civil war. . . .

"Have these Labor candidates forgotten what Mr. Fenner Brockway, the well-known member of the I.L.P., stated about the source from which the Communist Party gets its money and its instructions He said:

" 'Take the position of the British Communist Party. *Its subsidy from the Comintern must run into tens of thousands a year. . . . If the orders of the Comintern were not obeyed the subsidy would stop.* The activities of the British Communist Party would almost completely stop.' (*New Leader*, June 30, 1932.)

"Yet it is the Labor Party, which uses such tools to achieve its ends, that is asking for your votes.

"*Keep clear of parties that toy with revolution.*

"*Vote National.*"

There can be no doubt at all but that as a result of its policy in the general election the Communist Party greatly increased its mass influence, and got into closer contact than ever before with the workers in the Labor Party and trade unions.

The first elementary steps have been achieved on which we now have to build in the future. It is necessary not to exaggerate what has been done. We did not fully establish the united front in the sense of official agreement, it was not in many cases looked upon as being anything more than a common fight during the special circumstances of a general election. But the contacts made, the work done, provide the basis for going forward to various forms of united action in the future that can finally bring about a united front in the same way as it has been established in France.

We make this point, so that there shall not develop inside the ranks of the Communist Party a feeling that the main struggle for unity has now been accomplished. It has not. Far from it, only the first steps have been taken, but they yielded such good results that they only serve to emphasize what mighty achievements could be recorded if we can break through the resistance of the Labor leaders to the united front. Achievements that would also have the most important results in the struggle to achieve international unity.

At the same time it is necessary to record certain weaknesses in our work, in order to avoid them in the future. The Election Manifesto of the Communist Party was not sufficiently concrete, and it was also a political error not to show in it the relation of the fight for the immediate demands of the workers in the development towards the overthrow of capitalism and the aim of Soviet Power.

There was a great lack of independent Party meetings to explain to the workers the reason for our change of policy, why the building of the united front is so urgent, the line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the popularization of our revolutionary aims.

There was an entirely inefficient fight for the official recognition by the Labor Party organizations of the united front even in those places where it existed; such recognition is important above all as a means of exerting mass pressure on the Labor leaders who opposed the united front. The danger existed of the locals of our Party becoming completely submerged in the official propaganda of the Labor Party; the locals did not sufficiently stand out as the organized force driving forward the line of the united struggle now against the policy of the National Government, as the one certain way of bring about its decisive defeat. Bound up with this was the losing of many opportunities for recruiting to the Communist Party and the *Daily Worker* as a certain means of strengthening every phase of present and future united front activity.

It becomes clear now that our mistakes were due to insufficient attention to that part of Comrade Dimitroff's report to the Seventh Congress where he specifically dealt with the question of the "consolidation of the Communist Parties and struggle for the political unity of the proletariat" and especially where he states:

> "Comrades, in the struggle for the establishment of the united front, the importance of the leading role of the Com-

munist Party increases extraordinarily. . . . Only the Communist Party is at bottom the initiator, the organizer and the driving force of the united front of the working class.

"The Communist Parties can ensure the mobilization of the broadest masses of the toilers for a united struggle against fascism and the offensive of capital *only if they strengthen their own ranks in every respect,* if they develop their initiative, pursue a Marxist-Leninist policy and concrete flexible tactics which take into account the concrete situation and alignment of class forces.

"The united front of the proletariat brings to the fore an array of workers which will be able to carry out its mission if this army is headed by a leading force which will point out its aims and paths. This leading force can *only be a strong proletarian revolutionary party.*

"The strengthening of the Communist Parties is not a narrow Party concern, but the concern of the entire working class. *The unity, revolutionary coherence and fighting preparedness of the Communist Parties constitute most valuable capital which belongs not only to us but to the entire working class.*"

If in the development of the next stages of the struggle to achieve unity in action, the Communist Party of Great Britain will ever bear in mind these basic leads of Comrade Dimitroff, we will not only avoid mistakes and opportunist deviations, we shall see a very great numerical strengthening of the Communist Party as well as a widening of its political influence.

The first foundations for united action have now been laid, and we can never go back again to the old position that existed before the general election. We now have to build upon those foundations.

A moment's consideration of the situation and the gravity of the position with the National Government in power will convince all serious-minded workers that not less united front *activity,* but more, is now the supreme need of the hour.

Nothing would be more fatal than to believe we have to wait until the next general election before we can give battle to the National Government. A new period of struggle already opens out. A series of small but significant strikes have already taken place which undoubtedly have been influenced by the miners' huge majority ballot for strike action.

It is the signal for a series of coming industrial conflicts.

The National Government takes power again, not in an atmosphere of industrial peace at home, and a peaceful situation abroad. On the contrary, the three decisive sections of trade unionists, the miners, railwaymen and engineers, are in a fighting mood to obtain wage increases. The unemployed know that the government will endeavor to reintroduce the cuts in relief allowances they were forced to withdraw earlier this year. The people who are against war have observed the international repercussions arising from the National Government's victory, *i.e.,* the Franco-German negotiations, and Laval's attempt to postpone the ratification of the Franco-Soviet Peace Pact, and they are getting ready to oppose the government's war plans. The unrest

in Egypt and India, the policy of Japan in North China, the policy of British imperialism in Ethiopia, all together make for a situation which, whilst fraught with dangers for workers and lovers of peace, is also pregnant with tremendous possibilities for developing national and international solidarity that can strike tremendous blows against the National Government.

The three main issues demanding united action are:

1. The campaign of the miners.
2. The fight against Part II of the Unemployment Act.
3. Against the government's war preparations.

All of them are immediate issues which in every locality can carry forward the united front achieved in the elections.

The Communist Party has now its greatest opportunity for leading the way forward. Every single contact made with Labor men and women during the general election campaign should now be drawn into further united activity. The most persevering and painstaking efforts must be made to carry forward in the next stages of the fight the united struggle of all who in the Labor Party, trade unions, cooperatives, Socialist League and I.L.P. are desirous of working together against the common enemy.

The first start has been made in healing the breach which has existed for many years between various sections of the working class, the foundation has been firmly laid for great future united struggles together. Unity in action has already in scores of constituencies now found a deep response on the part of active sections of the Labor movement. There may have been cases where some Labor candidates have supported a united front with the Communist Party for careerist reasons, but the majority of the Labor candidates accepted the support of the Communists and especially the rank and file of the Labor Party have done so because of political conviction of the need for unity.

The personal contacts and the experiences of working side by side against the common enemy have revealed that there is more in common than there is of opposition between the local Labor Parties and the Communist Party.

While the Communist Party has avoided maintaining any illusion regarding the Labor Party policy as a whole, or any illusions regarding the Labor Government being in a position to inaugurate fundamental measures of socialism, we are at the same time proud of the way our Party has led the fight against the National Government, and by our election tactics made possible so many Labor gains, which are gains for united struggle against poverty, reaction and war.

We are proud in the conditions of our country that we have applied the line of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, a line that gives to workers of all capitalist countries the clear perspective of one united working class political party and one united working class International.

The new experiences must become the basis upon which united action and support is rallied behind the miners, the fight of the unem-

ployed, and especially against the new war plans of the ruling class.

What has been achieved is nothing to what could have been the case if the leaders of the Labor Party had the interest of the workers sufficiently at heart to lift the ban on the united front with the Communist Party and acknowledge—what scores of local and divisional Labor Parties have done—that unity with the Communists strengthens the struggle against the employers, landlords and bankers.

The doors of Transport House, so long bolted and barred against common action with the Communist Party, have, by the mass pressure of the rank and file of the Labor Party in the general election and the results achieved by the united front of Labor Party and Communist Party in the election been prised open a little.

The mass movement of the workers must be borne to a point where the doors can be forced wide open and break down all remaining barriers and obstacles to united action.

We must fight together permanently. If we do, no power on earth can prevent us going forward to such victories and conquests as will open out a glorious phase in our history.

One of the most essential pre-requisites for the carrying forward of the workers' struggle is the winning over of those who are in "agreement" with the objects of the Communist Party, and agree with its policy, to join the Party.

If, as a result of what has been done in the election, thousands of workers find their way into the ranks of the Communist Party, this means an enormous strengthening of the forces for united action.

The role of the *Daily Worker* now assumes special importance. It is in fact the key to the whole solution of the struggle for unity. The whole character of the *Daily Worker* must now be transformed so that it can really lead the fight for unity by becoming the daily champion of the daily struggle and reflecting in its contents, make up, methods of distribution the mass support of all those workers who are fighting for the united front.

We must change the *Daily Worker* from being a rather narrow Party organ to becoming the recognized workers' united front newspaper. This means drawing in wider forces than those at present organized in the Communist Party. Non-Party workers must more and more be brought into direct work on the production of the paper.

In the broadest and most popular way the *Daily Worker* must now reflect every phase of the workers' fight against the National Government and the employers, bringing into the paper the views, ideas, suggestions of every section of the Labor movement. Encouragement must be given to all people who are against poverty, fascism, and war to help in producing such a daily newspaper.

Our column must be thrown wide open to all who desire to strengthen the cause of peace, who stand for the closest relations with the Soviet Union, to all those in factories and trade unions who want to strengthen the daily fight against the employers and bring about a speedy unification of the trade union forces and organizations. To all those who in

the localities fight for the workers' interests in the local Labor parties, co-operative movement, on the local Councils. To all those who fight to preserve all democratic rights, to all those who are opposed to the oppression of the colonial peoples.

In this way the new forces will be gathered around the paper, and the organization of the *Daily Worker's* Readers League will have to take this perspective into account in all its future work, in fact, it will play the greatest role in helping to bring about the type of popular workers' united front newspaper we have in mind.

We believe it is possible in this way to produce such a *Daily Worker* that every active militant worker in the labor movement will feel a direct responsibility for, and that the *Daily Worker* is their newspaper, that they have had a part in its production, and in this way there will be organized around the paper tens of thousands of active supporters and collaborators, which will give the guarantee for striking deep roots in the very heart of every working class organization, and enabling a tremendous strengthening of every phase of the daily struggle to be achieved and unity to be established.

It will not be an easy task to accomplish, but the improvements already made in recent months in the *Daily Worker* give the guarantee that we can fulfill this task.

The Communist Party has already applied to the Labor Party that it be accepted as an affiliated organization. We have made it clear that we will loyally abide by all decisions that correspond to the interests of the workers, and at the same time that we retain our separate identity as a Communist Party and our associations with the Communist International.

The fight for affiliation is part of the fight for unity, it is the next step in that direction. The experience in the elections proved in the most practical way that the Communist Party and the Labor Party can work together. The carrying of this forward would result in a great advance in every stage of the daily struggle. It would give new life and inspiration to the whole labor movement. It would help those rank and file Labor workers who are dissatisfied with the present official policy of the Labor Party and who want it changed.

We are confident that our application will receive wide support from the trade union branches, and local Labor parties, and the Communist Party must organize the widest support to ensure its application being granted by the pressure of the workers organized in the Labor Party and the trade unions.

If the Communist Party becomes an affiliated Party to the Labor Party it means also that a first step will have been taken in the direction of a united working class political party in Britain. And as a means of helping towards the creation of a Labor Party and policy that fights capitalism and also towards the wider perspective we have indicated, the Communist Party is prepared to work in collaboration with all Labor men and women in the preparation of a fighting program and policy that can represent a further demonstration of our desire to

strengthen the labor movement and its fight against its class enemies.

The Communist Party will popularize its alternative concrete proposals in answer to the National Government's intentions to spend millions in armaments.

The Communist Party will at once do everything in its power to help the miners: to popularize their cause amongst all other industrial workers and organize the mass movement for sympathetic action in all essential cases alongside the miners in spite of such legislation as the Trades Disputes Act.

Comrade Gallacher, the first M.P. elected on the basis of a Communist program, will, in and out of Parliament, do everything in his power to advance the cause of united action, to consolidate mass opposition to the National Government, and especially to build up inside Parliament a real fighting Labor Opposition that can act as a great stimulus to the workers' struggle outside.

In these varied ways, the Communist Party will prove to still wider masses that it fights for the unity of the working class and thus lead the way to the opening of an entirely different political perspective in Britain, other than what the National Government have in mind.

The work already done in this direction in the recent general election by the Communist Party, the stimulus given to the Party by the victory of Comrade Gallacher are the guarantee that we, British Communists, shall rise to the level of the tasks facing us and break through the opposition of the British Labor leaders to the united front on a national and international scale.

The Maiden Speech of William Gallacher, M.P.

WE are reprinting below the speech of Comrade William Gallacher in the House of Commons on December 4, 1935. It is a brilliant speech of a real representative of the British proletariat in Parliament, the first candidate to be elected on the basis of a Communist program.

EDITORIAL BOARD.

MR. GALLACHER: As a new member, I have been given advice by many older members of the House, and I will endeavor to avail myself of it in so far as it is consistent with what I am supposed to do as the representative of a great working class constituency.

I have been advised that, on rising to address the House, one should make at least a reference to the preceding speech. I am sorry that in this case I cannot accept that advice.

[The previous speaker was Lady Astor.]

I cannot tolerate such flippancy, coming as I do from a constituency where the Medical Officer last year could issue a report that 50 per cent of the children attending the schools were suffering from disease or defects.

I have seen the harrowing effects of the most terrible poverty and suffering in the homes of the people, and I am not of the temper that takes these things lightly.

In the King's speech are many questions that must be dealt with frankly.

NO ROBBER AGGRESSION

There is the conflict in Ethiopia. I want to bring out clearly the issue that is involved, for some of my honorable friends for whom I have great regard have won applause from the other side of the House on this question. I hope I may never see the day when I win applause from the opposite side of the House.

I am concerned with the fact that confusion is being created on this vital question, and is being used by supporters of the government.

The great Labor movement in this country stands for rigid opposition to robber aggression on principle.

These benches represent support for the Ethiopians, a colonial people, in the fight they are making to maintain their independence. That is the vital difference between this side of the House and the other.

Questions of sanctions and the application of sanctions cannot be allowed to confuse this difference.

The leader of the Liberal Party yesterday gave an exhibition of

the most deliberate self-deception on this point. I do not mind him deceiving himself, but I object to him trying to deceive others.

He said that the foreign secretary's speech at Geneva represented a change of policy.

It represented nothing of the sort, but only a continuation of a policy that has been pursued by the National Government, adapted to a new situation. It represented the brazen hypocrisy that has appeared time and time again in the utterances of representatives of the National Government.

How any man could make such a speech I do not know, with a National Government imposing its military control over Egypt, with the iron heel of British imperialism crushing down the Indians.

If there is to be independence for Ethiopia, for which we stand, then there must be independence for Egypt, for India, for all colonial peoples, and the right of the colonial peoples to work out their own destiny associated with and assisted by the more advanced western peoples.

Is the National Government cooperating with the League of Nations?

Reference was made by the leader of the opposition to dualism, but that word is being used now to create an entirely wrong impression.

A DOUBLE GAME

You can easily have an immediate program and an ultimate aim.

The National Government is pursuing not a dual policy but is playing a double game, and is preparing, if the opportunity presents itself, for what the Americans call a "double cross".

The National Government is ready at any moment to double cross the League of Nations and to double cross Ethiopia if it can make a deal with Italy.

The Foreign Secretary, when he made his speech, was pursuing exactly the same policy as the previous Foreign Secretary when he was handling the Japanese affair.

Never until this situation arose did we see in the National Government any passionate desire for the League of Nations.

When Japan invaded Manchuria, the then Foreign Secretary did not support the League of Nations against Japan; he became the spokesman for Japan against the League of Nations. Why?

Because he told you that he was trying to get a deal with Japan that would guarantee British railway interests in Manchuria and China.

The passion for the League of Nations only arose when British imperial and financial interests were threatened in the North of Africa.

The attitude of the National Government towards the League of Nations is to utilize it as far as it can in order to force Italy to make a deal for the safeguarding of British interests in the Sudan and Egypt.

When the Right Honorable Gentleman, the Member for Warwick and Leamington [Mr. Eden] was in Moscow last year, in a real atmosphere of peace. . . . [Interruption.]

Yes, war does not come from the heart of human beings; it comes as a consequence of the greed for territory and trading profits.

Take away the incentive of the element of profit and you take away the incentive for war.

In Soviet Russia there is no desire for any territory outside their own. Stalin has said that they do not covet an inch of anybody else's territory, but will not give up an inch of their own. For the building of socialism they must have peace, and so a peace policy is being pursued. . . .

While the Right Honorable Member of Warwick and Leamington was there in what he himself declared to be a real peace atmosphere, the Foreign Secretary was grovelling before the butcher of Berlin. The door was slammed shut and you had the spectacle of the British Foreign Secretary waiting until he was given permission to enter.

Did that produce peace or peace discussions?

It produced the German Naval Pact, drove France away from Britain into the arms of Italy, and gave Italy the opportunity, as a result of the unsettling of the whole European situation, to make an attack upon Ethiopia.

I challenge anyone to deny that had there been no pro-German policy, there would have been no war against Ethiopia.

The German Naval Pact was the coping stone on the remilitarization of Germany.

BROKEN MEN

There is a Cenotaph in Whitehall, erected to a million young Britishers done to death in Flanders and on other fronts. There are a million more broken men. I will take you around some of the asylums; I will take you to the hospitals.

They were sent to die to destroy German militarism, which was menacing civilization. But now German militarism is erected stronger than ever before. Will honorable gentlemen take down the Cenotaph?

The rearming of Germany has brought a menace to the whole of civilization.

Now, the scene having changed, the one-time Foreign Secretary, Hitler's man Friday, is at the home office. So we are getting a German invasion of London.

Is any honorary member prepared to say that this has anything to do with bonafide football and sport? [Interruption.]

Honorable gentlemen may laugh, but do not let them forget that this invasion may be the forerunner of a different invasion.

Whatever animates the German militarist, whoever they would desire to crush at the moment, there is one thing that will always stand before them, and that is the hope that the day may come when they may crush the imperialists of Britain and invade London.

An honorable member with a touch of humor said that if you put men on to making armaments, 16s in a pound will go in wages. If you put men to dig holes in the sand, 20s in the pound will go in wages.

If honorable members are so engaged about armaments, why not get men and boys piling up metal on each side of the House and we can settle our quarrels by throwing scrap-iron at each other.

You cannot ever hope to combat the war spirit that has remained in Germany by building up armaments.

That can only be done by denouncing the German Naval Treaty, and then, associating with that greatest peace power in the world, the Soviet Union, associating with and supporting the Franco-Soviet peace pact, and around this, building all the peace nations of Europe.

If you have 50 nations cooperating for peace and carrying forward a steady policy of peace and disarmament, through their economic and financial power, you can force the other nations to disarm also.

If you use your economic and financial power, Germany and Japan will be forced to disarm.

The National Government, composed of Tory die hards with the discredited remnants of other parties thrown in, will never lead the fight for peace.

WHAT OF DEFENSE?

Have you defended the miners' families in Wales, Lancashire, on the Northeast coast and in Scotland? Have you defended these places—go and look at them—which give the appearance of a country that has been devastated by the enemy? Have you defended the miners?

There were over 1,000 men killed in the pits last year and nearly 200,000 injured. Have you defended them?

Come with me to the mining villages, and, day after day, you can see the terrible tragedy of the pit, and the tragedy of the miners' homes.

Have you defended the unemployed? We have heard about the Means Test.

Yesterday the honorable member for Bridgeton [Mr. Maxton] drew attention to the gyrations of honorable gentlemen opposite in connection with the Means Test during the election.

There was not one member on the other side prepared to stand up for the Means Test as it was being operated in any industrial constituency in the country.

Why? Because of the terrible effects the Means Test was having upon men, women and children in the country.

Not one of them would defend it or stand for it. When pressure is brought to bear upon the matter, we hear some flippant talk about going to change it. You are going to change it, but are you going to compensate in any way for the evil you have done during the past four years?

THE PARALYZED HERO

I have heard of hundreds of cases, but one of the most outstanding in my mind at the moment is that about one of the heroes who came back from the war paralyzed.

He has lain in bed since the end of the war and has never moved.

Do you remember the promise we made as to the treatment that these heroes were to receive?

Do you remember how the duke and the worker were to walk along the road hand-in-hand, with roses on every side and happiness lying close at hand?

Here is a paralyzed man lying in bed. His boy grows to manhood—he is 21 years of age—and gets a job.

The Means Test is operated in that home. The boy is persuaded to leave home and live with relatives so that the family income shall not be interfered with. He leaves his bed-ridden father and weeping mother and goes to his new home.

He cannot eat; he cannot sleep. Despair settles upon him, and in a week comes the end—suicide.

He is driven to death by the Means Test, as thousands of others have been done to death. Were you anxious for them?

Are you going to change it because you have seen the ghastly work which you have done? I have seen it, and I cannot forget it.

You have not defended the unemployed and the mothers and the children. It is all very well for the Prime Minister, in his introductory speech, to say that on the question of maternity and midwifery there will not be any need for political opposition. It is a very serious problem and one which is dear to his heart.

The Chief Medical Officer, in his report last year, drew attention to the fact that we were making no headway against maternal mortality. Where does the trouble come from?

It comes from low wages and low unemployment relief. The mothers and children have to suffer.

You may pay tribute to, or worship, the Madonna and Child, but day after day you are doing the Madonna and Child to death.

On this side of the House we represent and speak for the workers of this country, the men who toil and sweat.

HONORABLE MEMBERS ON GOVERNMENT BENCHES: So do we.

GALLACHER: All right. We shall see. The leader of the miners says that theirs is the hardest, most dangerous and poorest paid job in the country. Is there anybody who will deny it?

The miners made a demand. They ballot for it, and the ballot is a record, and we who speak for and on behalf of the miners demand an increase of 2s. a day for the miners.

That's how we speak for the miners. Now it is your turn. Speak now. Two shillings a day for the miners! Speak, you who claim to represent the miners.

We say not a penny for armaments. It is a crime against the people of this country to spend another penny on armaments.

Every penny we can get should go in wages for the miners, towards the health and well-being of the mothers and the children and adequate pensions for the aged and infirm. Last night the Chancellor of the Exchequer was meeting some friends, and they were having a dinner, the cost of which was 35s. a head. Thirty-five shillings a head for a

dinner, and 10s. a week for any aged man or woman who has given real service to this country and has worked in factory or mine.

We require every penny we can get in order to make life better for the working class.

If the £7,000,000,000 which we spent during the war in ruin and destruction had been spent in making life brighter and better for the people of this country, what a difference it would have made.

I would make an earnest appeal to honorable members of the House who have not yet become case-hardened in iniquity.

The National Government are travelling the road of 1914, which will surely lead to another and more terrible war, and to the destruction of civilization.

Are honorable members going to follow them down that road?

I make an appeal even while I give a warning.

Do not try to stop us on the road along which we are travelling. Do not try to block the road by the meshes of legal entanglements or by fascist gangs.

Do not try it lest an evil day come upon you and you have to pay a price far beyond any present reckoning.

From the Letter of an English Comrade on the General Elections

ONLY a brief survey of the workers' reactions in the recent general election is needed to show that a victory could have been won given a fighting leadership and full unity in action. This year in spite of the handicaps, in case after case the class solidarity of the workers broke through the barriers and resulted in resounding successes.

The capitalist press and politicians came out with many reports about the "hooliganism" at meetings, about "candidates being denied freedom of speech", etc., making this talk of "mob law" the cover for very serious threats to democracy. The facts were that in the face of really terrific provocations, the workers' indignation and hatred were never really given full vent to as a result of the conditions existing.

At the same time there are some interesting examples of the workers' reactions.

It was symbolic that the renegade Labor Ex-Premier MacDonald in the mining and country constituency of Seaham in meeting after meeting was faced with the stormy protests of the workers suffering under the Means Test and the terrible conditions and low wages of the miners. The men and women of Seaham, who demonstrated so effectively that they wiped the sneer off his face for a time at any rate, were expressing the feelings of anger, hatred, and contempt held by millions of toilers in Britain, for the man who had above all others betrayed them. This culminated on polling day in the most decisive defeat ever administered to any ex-Premier. His majority of several thousand votes in the election of 1931 was turned into a minority of over 20,000.

Another similar incident took place in a Scottish constituency. There were two candidates. One was the Labor candidate who was being supported by the Communist Party and the other was the National Government candidate who had been an M.P. in the last Parliament. Just before polling day arrangements were being made for big indoor meetings in one of the main towns in the constituency. There are only two halls suitable and available for such meetings and the practice has been for each candidate to have one of the halls for his meeting. One hall was engaged by the National Government candidate and advertised. Imagine the feelings of the workers when they found that the other hall was not available for the Labor candidate, because the National Government candidate had also booked and paid for it, in order to keep it closed that evening although he would hold no meeting in it. The result was seen in the hostile demonstration of the workers at his meeting that night. Some workers were arrested and the capitalist press screamed about "hooliganism" but the real hooligan was not mentioned by them. The workers on polling day ended his parliamentary career for him by electing the Labor candidate.

A further example of the handicaps in this case of a financial character imposed on the workers is shown in the case of the Irish Communist Party. The period between the Government announcing the new elections and the day for nomination was about 14 days. £150 had to be deposited along with the nomination papers of each candidate. In the case of our candidate in Belfast they were only able to raise £103 in pennies and sixpences from the workers and therefore their candidate was not nominated owing to the financial difficulty and the very short time at their disposal.

Probably one of the best examples of the workers' strength and enthusiasm on the one hand and the effect it had on their enemies comes from West Fife, the constituency that returned Willie Gallacher as Communist M.P. The counting of the votes took place in the Sheriff Buildings at Dunfermline. The door of the building opens directly on to the main street along which pass the tram cars. For hours before the result was announced the workers commenced to gather in the street. The police kept regulating the crowd to let pedestrians pass on the pavement and the trams in the street. However, the crowd became so big that by the time the first result was to be announced (two constituencies' votes, Dunfermline Burghs and West Fife were counted here) the trams had to be diverted and the whole street was blocked by a dense mass of workers bubbling over with enthusiasm and anticipation. Inside the building when the result became known the Labor candidate Adamson declared: "It is unbelievable," and demanded a recount. This meant that Gallacher's result was held up for one and one-half hours after the other constituency, but the bulk of the crowd outside waited. When the sheriff, who was the returning officer, led the way outside the temporary platform and the crowd saw Gallacher, following him they showed that Gallacher's victory was anything but "unbelievable" to them. They cheered and cheered for several minutes.

Most illuminating was the conduct of the sheriff. He is the man in Fife who was defeated by the miners. In the court, time after time, in his wig and gown he has sat calmly doling out heavy sentences on miners found guilty in strike struggles or unemployed eviction fights and demonstrations. Just a few days previously he had sent a boy of eighteen who had never been in court in his life to seven days in prison for breaking a window in the motor car of the Labor candidate at an election meeting.

Faced by this roaring enthusiastic crowd he was so agitated as to have no control of his feelings. He held the paper which contained the result in his two hands in front of him and his hands trembled so violently that it was clear he was not reading from the paper when he declared the result. After the tumult died down a little he spoke, but as soon as he mentioned Gallacher's name there was another outburst and nobody heard the figures. That he fully realised the significance of the result was borne out by his further actions. As soon as he had mumbled out the declaration that Gallacher was now the M.P. for West Fife he turned and without even attempting to carry through the invariable formality of

offering his congratulation to the successful candidate, he stumbled back down from the improvised platform and into the building while the crowd bareheaded sang the *International* and cheered the victory.

It has been absolutely great and everybody here is on top of the world. If Harry * had got in we would have left the world and landed up in the stratosphere. There were great scenes of enthusiasm when the result in Fife was announced and after the declaration we toured the constituency with four motor cars, Bill making short speeches in each of the mining villages. You have no idea of the effect of the vote on the workers in these places. In Lumphinians when the vote was 'phoned through before we arrived the miners and their wives crowded onto the streets cheering, dancing and singing. They stopped the motor bus traffic on the main road through the town with their numbers for a period. In Bowhill they had the Fife band out to meet us and hauled Bill out of the car carrying him shoulder high at the head of the procession to the Big Tree [pub] where he mounted the top of the car and made a speech amidst terrific enthusiasm. In Valleyfield, where the strike is in its sixth week, the Miners' Institute was packed with men, women and children at 10:30 p.m. when we arrived after a 28-mile ride across the country. The scenes were unforgettable here; cheering, shouting and calls of encouragement. This strike and the role of the U.M.S. and Gallacher have been decisive in the result of the election and when Gallacher renewed his pledges to the men and women there, on behalf of himself and the Party, a veritable storm of enthusiasm swept the meeting. It was tremendous. From what I can gather outside the effect has been electrical.

I won't try to make any estimate of the political consequences of Bill's election, but it is necessary to remember the effect it had. When I got to Fife there was great confidence. I worked in Kelty, one of the weakest areas for us previously and one which must have given Adamson** even this time vote for vote with us, but it was possible to see the change taking place and we made very big progress. In other areas we had 90 per cent of the workers with us, Lumphinans, Hillo'beath, etc., while in Bowhill, Lochore, Gleneraig, Crossgates and Crosshill we had a majority. In Valleyfield we had over 90 per cent of the strikers and their wives (and that means 90 per cent of the village). There is not the slightest reason now why in Fife we should not have a mass Party and the first steps are already being taken. Bill received about fifty telegrams of congratulations from Party, Labor League of Youth, Clarion Clubs, Y.C.L., unemployed groups and individuals. The line of the Congress has been brilliantly justified and it is a great help in convincing not only Labor people whom we have worked with but even some of our own members who were not fully convinced of the need to support Labor candidates and fight for a Labor Government. The results of the election are clear proof of the results of the Labor leaders' line although the electoral system has also weighted the elections in favor of the

* Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain.—*Editor.*

** Candidate of the Labor Party and an opponent to the united front.—*Editor.*

government as an analysis will show. There is a lot of disappointment among the rank and file of the Labor Party, but the fight for unity has been strengthened.

Everywhere during the election was the contrast, the workers showing their class loyalty and anxiety to strike a blow at the hated National Government, and the leaders who had already abdicated the fight and were confusing the millions who could have been won.

How this loyalty of the workers to their organizations was operating against their own interests is illustrated in a question put to me in a packed meeting of miners in the Rhondda. One miner asked: "Aren't we committing ourselves against the Miners Federation if we vote for action of the 2/– in the miners' ballot and for Pollitt in the election?" He explained further that what he meant was that he was for the 2/–, but if he voted for Pollitt, wasn't he going against the Federation whose policy he identified with that of the Labor Party? Of course it was explained to him that the best interests of himself and the Federation in the fight for the 2/– would be served by the miners returning Pollitt to Parliament and the tremendous asset Pollitt as an M.P. would be in this fight was fully outlined. At the same time there were many workers in Rhondda East who were held back from support for Pollitt by the influence of the South Wales Miners' Federation behind the Labor candidate, and Pollitt's vote of 13,600 in face of this and the unity of the coalowners, Tories and Liberals behind the Labor candidate, represent a tremendous achievement for the Communist Party in South Wales.

These achievements have been made thanks to the magnificent work of the C.P.G.B. using in a very correct and living way the weapon of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

The Stalinist School of Revolutionary Struggle for the Victory of Bolshevism

[*The material given below and published in the Bolshevik press in the U.S.S.R., contains reminiscences of old workers, concerning various episodes connected with the activity of Comrade Stalin at the dawn of the revolutionary movement in the Trans-Caucasus, when the foundations of Bolshevik organizations were laid down there under the direct leadership of Comrade Stalin.*]

MEMORABLE DAYS

WHILE listening to the report of Comrade Beria* on the history of the Bolshevik organizations of the Trans-Caucasus, many events passed before me connected with the birth of the revolutionary movement in the Trans Caucasus, with the struggle which took place under the leadership of Comrade Stalin.

The two evenings during which the leading Party workers in Tiflis were in session, recalled all these events to my mind.

I called to mind the days when the "mesamedasists"** tried to mold my mind, but all to no real purpose.

For several years I was in the habit of reading a magazine entitled *Kvali*,*** and for about eighteen months I was a member of the "Mesamedasists" Sunday School, and heard Ramishvili and Tcheidze talk there.

What did they teach us? They taught us about how the stars, the sun, the moon, and the earth revolve in the sky, but they never told us anything about how the revolutionary working class moves. I never once heard anything of this from them, nor did I succeed in reading anything about it during the several years I was acquainted with them.

But then Stalin came.

He found me, among other workers; got together a small, illegal study circle, and in the course of two or three meetings of this circle he removed the bandage from my eyes—I was a comparatively backward worker then—and showed me how the proletarian revolutionary struggles moves.

---

* Beria's report to the meeting of the Tiflis leading Party workers on July 21-22, 1935—"On the Question of the History of Bolshevik Organizations in the Trans-Caucasus", published in a separate booklet in the Russian language, Partisdat, C.C. of the C.P.S.U.—*Ed*

** "Mesame-dasi" (meaning the third group)—the first Social-Democratic organization to be founded in Georgia (1893-1898). The author and ideologist of all the program works of the "mesame-dasi" was Noy Jordania. Noy Jordania and the majority of the mesamedasists rejected the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement; they considered the class struggle a secondary consideration and subordinated it to the interests of the bourgeois-national movement.

In 1898 Comrade Stalin joined this group and brought a new and revolutionary spirit into the life of the group. The minority of the "mesame-dasi" led by Comrade Stalin, in a determined, irreconcilable struggle against the majority, later took shape as the Leninist Social-Democratic, Bolshevik organization of the Trans-Caucasus.—*Ed.*

*** *Kvali*, the organ of the mesamedasists.—*Ed.*

One day Comrade Stalin asked me: "What do they teach you in the Sunday School?" And when I told him that they taught us about how the sun moves, he smiled and said:

"Listen! The sun will go on moving without you, have no fear, it won't lose its way. But you come and learn how the cause of revolution should move, and fix me up a little illegal printshop."

And we did this for Stalin.

That is how Comrade Stalin got the workers together, drew them away from the "Mesamedasists" and brought them into the Party.

We all know the part that Comrade Stalin played in organizing the Batum workers, and in creating the revolutionary Social-Democratic organization in Batum. Stalin led the Batum workers on the road to relentless struggle against the autocracy and the bourgeoisie.

How did the people, who were telling us tales about the movement of the planets and so forth, react to this?

What did Tcheidze, Ramishvili, and the other future "lights" of Menshevism have to say, then?

They said the same things then as the Mensheviks said a little later, *viz.*, that there was no need to resort to arms.

There is now no particular need to show the tremendous importance of the Batum events. The working class won in the long run because it was prepared and trained for revolutionary battles through such lessons as those drawn from the Batum events of 1902.

I remember Comrade Stalin again—already a firm Leninist. Once he happened to show me the first or second number of *Iskra* and read an article about the Chinese Boxers, signed by N.L. This was quite an event for me.

He said to me: "If the *Iskra* gets into your hands, read it carefully, and pay special attention to the articles of N.L."

I remember meeting Comrade Stalin in Baku in 1904, when I was sent there to set up a printshop. When we had organized it, I went for manuscripts of our leaflets to our secret meeting place. There I met Stalin. He had brought his proclamations. The revival of the working class movement at that time in Baku was the result of the untiring work of Comrade Stalin. The Baku Bolshevik organization took shape and grew up under the guidance of Comrade Stalin. He created glorious traditions which are treasured by the proletarians of Baku, and which inspire them in the struggle for new victories of Socialism.

S. Todria.

"TAKE GOOD CARE OF THE CHAINS. THEY WILL COME IN HANDY—FOR USE ON THE TSARIST GOVERNMENT"

Reminiscences of the Old Worker of the Tiflis Main Railway Repair Shop

I FIRST met Stalin in 1898. He was quite young then.

In Nakhalovka (that was the name then of that part of Tiflis where the workers of the main repair shops of the Trans-Caucasian

Railway used to live), in the house of Aisor Aivaza, meetings used to be held between Zakro Chodrishvili, George Tcheidze, Ninua, myself and some other workers. Later Silvester Djibladze joined us, not alone but in the company of a young man whom we did not know. He was Comrade Stalin.

Comrade Stalin was given a few Russian and Georgian circles to lead, because he knew both languages well. Later we discovered that besides leading circles in the main repair shops, Comrade Stalin also led other circles in the town itself.

The guidance he gave soon began to be felt in the work of the circles. At that time the leading Social-Democratic group of the Tiflis organization was taking shape. We used to call this group "the committee" then. None of us ever thought that this committee ought to be elected. And then one of the Russian Social-Democratic circles guided by Comrade Stalin (in the lathe department of the main repair shops), demanded that the committee be elected. The demand was taken up a little later by other circles. Thus, the first elected committee of our organization was established on November 11, 1901, on the initiative of Comrade Stalin and the circles he led, at the First Tiflis Conference of the Social-Democratic organizations.

I remember how Comrade Stalin persistently demanded that we pass to more determined action against the tsarist autocracy, and undertake intensive revolutionary propaganda.

* * *

In 1905, among the workers of the main repair shops of the Trans-Caucasian railways, anarchist ideas were being spread. Some of the workers swallowed the bait of the anarchists.

To prevent these ideas taking root, it was decided to organize a discussion on the subject among the workers. I was entrusted with the task of bringing Comrade Koba to the discussion as the strongest opponent of the anarchists.

Comrade Stalin already enjoyed the reputation among us of being a fine orator who could present his views forcefully.

And so one evening, in two rooms chock-full of workers, the leaders of anarchism took the floor and tried to prove the correctness of their views. They spoke eloquently and everybody listened.

We all laid our hopes upon Comrade Stalin, who was sitting calmly and unruffled among us, and who only rarely interjected a remark.

And then he got up. . . . In this discussion he showed all his great erudition and scholarship, all his profound knowledge of Marxism. Quoting Bakunin and Marx, Comrade Stalin showed all the worthlessness of the doctrine of anarchism. The workers unanimously supported Comrade Koba.

* * *

Comrade Koba did much to develop himself. He was never without

books. If he carried no books in his hands, then he had them tucked in his coat, or in his belt.

Before I was exiled to Siberia, the tsarist government released me from prison for three days "to settle my domestic affairs", to get ready for the long journey. The comrades who were still at large arranged a farewell evening for me. Koba came as well, but without any books. What was our surprise when after a while he took a few workers aside, produced a little pamphlet from somewhere (I don't remember the name of it now), and began to read it to them.

Another time I met Comrade Koba in the Bailovsk prison in Baku. This time I was being sent from Tiflis to the Saratov central prison.

I discovered that Comrade Zakro Chodrishvili was in the Bailovsk prison, and as I wanted to see him, I began to shout aloud in the prison yard: "Hadji Murat!" (this was Comrade Zakro's Party pseudonym). In reply, a very familiar voice hailed me from the top floor. It was Koba.

I told him that I very much wanted to see Comrade Zakro. Koba promised to fix this up, and the next day I had a talk with Comrade Zakro Chodrishvili.

Never, however, shall I forget a prophesy made by Comrade Koba.

Before being sent away to Saratov, we were all lined up in the prison yard.

And suddenly we heard the voice of Comrade Stalin:

"Take good care of the chains, they will come in handy for use on the tsarist government!"

And in 1917, when our chains were broken, we remembered these prophetic words of Comrade Stalin.

I remember yet another episode. The Mensheviks greeted the tsarist manifesto of 1905 with great joy and triumph. They organized a demonstration of "loyal subjects", marching through the town armed with white flags to petition "His Majesty's Governor-General in the Caucasus". Following in the train of the buffoonery of the Mensheviks, I arrived at the corner of Bariatinsk Street and the Golovinsk Road. There I saw Comrade Koba, who turned to me and said: "Look what's going on! Instead of going armed, to attack the tsar and all his satellites, the Mensheviks are going to thank them!"

These words contained the militant program of action of a revolutionary Bolshevik.

Arakela Georgievich Okuashvili.

COMRADE STALIN LED OUR STUDY CIRCLE

IN 1899 I came to Tiflis as a fifteen-year-old boy and began to work in the railway repair shop. I lived with my uncle. Iliko Kopaleishvili, Vano Strua, Z. Chodrishvili, K. Tcheidze and Arakel Okuashvili were frequent visitors there. It was here also, in the house on Gorrisk, No. 4, that I remember so well, that I saw Comrade Stalin for the first time.

Both in 1899 and in 1900 I was at the May Day demonstrations, but do not remember them well as I was still a boy then and did not understand much of what I saw. After May Day in 1900, I began to understand more. From that time on I began to study in the young workers' circle which Comrade Stalin was leading.

I remember as though it were today all we did in the circle. There was Maisuradze, the blacksmith, Kopaleishvili, a turner, subsequently killed during a demonstration in Batum, Djikidze, killed in 1905, Tomaradze, who afterwards was sent to hard labor. We were all educated and trained in this circle by Comrade Stalin.

Our circle met in a new place each time.

It was my duty to let Comrade Stalin know the addresses.

I used to come to him in Potiisk Street, where he lived in the home of a worker, Mito Gurgenidze, in a modest, poorly furnished room. Generally I conducted him to the circle. He was very punctual, and if he went anywhere, he always left word saying when he would return.

Our circle meetings were very lively and interesting.

In a simple, understandable way, Comrade Stalin used to tell us of the tasks facing the workers in the struggle against the autocracy, and taught us the fundamentals of politics. Those who took part in our circle were inspired by their leader, and waited impatiently for the chance to carry out in practice all that their Party and their teacher prepared them for.

The opportunity soon presented itself. A strike began in the railway repair shops. We, of course, took part in it. And how overjoyed we were, when Comrade Stalin entrusted the work of fighting the scabs to us. *He assigned us all to positions where we were to stand on all the streets leading to the works.* And here we had to do everything possible to prevent scabs from getting into the workshops.

We studied almost the whole of the year in the circle led by Comrade Stalin. During that time we learned a lot and received the tempering which has remained with us for life. The figure of Comrade Stalin is impressed upon each one of us. I can see him before me now—spare, modest in habits and clothing, irreconcilable towards the enemies of the revolution, direct and clear in every word, in every reply he gave.

* * *

In 1902, while in Batum, Comrade Stalin began to prepare for the organization of a demonstration. Not long before this, there had been a demonstration in Batum which everyone remembers. It met with response among the farm laborers and the masses of the toiling peasantry.

In order to prepare for the demonstration, several people including myself, were called in from Tiflis. The big village of Kulashi near Batum, was best suited for the demonstration. Many people from the surrounding villages were to meet there for a religious holiday. And this was the time when the demonstration was to begin.

There were about 25 of us. And after dinner, we went out on to the square which was thickly packed with people. We were astonished at the large number of policemen and guards; even the chiefs of the police from Kutais had come over. We nevertheless decided to begin; we formed a circle, raised the red flag and carried it forward. A crowd quickly surrounded us, and the police and guards hurled themselves upon it. Many people were cruelly beaten. But we were proud that the red flag had been raised for the first time in a Georgian village.

When I met Comrade Stalin after this in Batum, he pointed out a number of mistakes we had made, without which the demonstration would have been still bigger and more impressive. But, as it was, it made a big impression. And yet before Comrade Stalin came to Batum, the Mensheviks preached that the revolutionary movement was impossible, not only in the surrounding villages, but in Batum itself.

* * *

After that, I met Comrade Stalin several times. I remember some of his activities, some of his speeches. The workers loved him very much, and if ever it were known that he was to speak anywhere many people came there. I remember the successes of his speech in Chiatura in 1905, where he unmasked the Mensheviks. The miners almost killed Lordkipanidze, a Menshevik, who tried to contradict Comrade Stalin.

* * *

Anybody who has met Comrade Stalin even once will not forget his modesty, wisdom, ability to speedily understand events and to give correct and clear instructions. They will not forget his foresight and ability to inspire a man for life with unbounded loyalty to the cause of the working class, with irreconcilability to all the enemies of the revolution.

P. L. HURPILAVA.

SCHOOL YEARS

COMRADE BERIA'S report at the meeting of the Tiflis Party activists on the history of the Bolshevik organizations in the Trans-Caucasus has called to mind various episodes in the struggle through which the Bolsheviks of the Trans-Caucasus passed under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, in the struggle against tsarism and the bourgeoisie, against traitors to the working class—the Mensheviks, nationalists and opportunists of all kinds.

* * *

I remember Comrade Stalin from his early years as a student of the Gorrisk Church School, where I studied as well. He was one of the poorest and most capable students.

In Akhalkalakakh he studied with me, and coached me for entry

into the seminary. By his talks with me on questions of the revolutionary movement, he prepared me also for political struggle.

He often met the peasants and talked with them.

I remember the following incident.

As we were walking along the road one day, we saw some ploughmen resting in the fields.

"Let's go in to them," said Comrade Stalin.

We went towards them.

Noticing the relish with which one of the peasants was eating his bread and fish, Comrade Stalin asked:

"Why are you fed so badly? You plough and sow and collect the harvests yourselves. So you ought to live better."

A peasant replied:

"We collect it ourselves, but we have to pay the chief of police and the priest. So what's left for us?"

And then they began to talk, and in the course of their conversation Comrade Stalin step by step began to explain why the peasant lives badly, who oppresses him, who are his friends and who his enemies. He spoke with such understanding and interest that the peasants asked him to come again and talk to them.

While in the seminary, he frequently carried illegal literature about him. The inspector of the seminary, Friar Dimitrii, wanted at all costs to catch Stalin red-handed. But Comrade Stalin hid the literature so skilfully that Friar Dimitrii was unsuccessful for a long time. One day, however, he managed to catch Soso when he was reading illegal literature. He skilfully wrenched it away from Soso, but the latter immediately snatched it back again.

Friar Dimitrii became indignant.

"Don't you see with whom you are dealing?"

Soso rubbed his eyes, stared fixedly at him and replied:

"I see a black spot in front of me, and nothing else!"

On Stalin's instructions and with his guidance we organized a student Social-Democratic committee.

There were 100 to 125 students in the circles organized by this committee. They paid membership dues (10 to 20 kopeks a month), and through me handed it over to the Party committee.

These recollections will always remain in my memory.

G. I. ELISAZEDASHVILI.

Greetings to Comrade Dimitroff from the Fourth Conference of the C.P. of Germany

DEAR Comrade Dimitroff: The Fourth Conference of the Communist Party of Germany sents ardent revolutionary greetings to you, courageous anti-fascist and Bolshevik helmsman of the Comintern.

At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, where the confidence and love of all Communists and anti-fascists throughout the world was shown to you, close comrade-in-arms of Stalin, with such force, you gave our Party in particular a decisive weapon for the fight against fascism and war. We are most profoundly convinced of the correctness of the criticism which you leveled at the methods we used in our mass work, and we welcome the new line of tactics adopted on your initiative at the Seventh World Congress, with all our hearts. You have shown us the way to build up the working class united front and the anti-fascist people's front. You have taught us the Bolshevik methods of struggle by means of which we can overthrow fascism. You showed us the high aim of working class unity, and pointed to the way this high aim could be achieved.

Your heroic action on behalf of the toiling people, for the interests of the working class and all toilers, has served as a mighty impulse to the working class united front and the anti-fascist people's front.

In the severest underground conditions, you held high the banner of Communism before the bloody fascist tribunal, and set a fine example of proletarian internationalism to the toiling masses oppressed by fascism. A courageous son of the Bulgarian proletariat, you stood before Hitler, Goering and Co., as an indomitable fighter of the world party of Lenin and Stalin. You showed us how Communists should fight on behalf of the broad masses. With your image before them, unforgettable fighters like Fiete Schultz went to the executioner's block. Many hundreds and thousands underwent torture and suffering in the dungeons of the Gestapo for carrying out their revolutionary duty in the fight against the bloody fascist regime. Many thousands in Hitler Germany are doing their revolutionary work, day in and day out, inspired with the desire to throw off the hateful fascist yoke and to win freedom for the toilers. For them you are an example and teacher. Our Party which, led by Comrade Thaelmann, has been trained in the spirit of unswerving loyalty to the Communist International, makes the solemn promise to you, hero of the anti-fascist struggle, fearless fighter for the emancipation of the toiling people, that we shall use all our strength for the fight to rally the masses against the bloody fascist dictatorship. In the tireless struggle to build up the working class united front and the anti-fascist people's front, and to bring about proletarian unity, in the fight against the criminal war plans and acts of provocation of fascism, we want to prove, and will prove that we are worthy of such a front line fighter and leader as you are.

Bolshevik greetings to the helmsman of the Communist International.

FOURTH CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

The Expulsion of Torgler from the Communist Party of Germany

THE conference of the illegal Communist Party of Germany held in Brussels in October of this year [1935], and attended by delegates from almost all the district organizations of the Party, was the first conference of the entire German Party to be held since the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. After discussing the behavior of Torgler, prior to and during the Leipzig trial in connection with the burning of the Reichstag, the conference adopted the following decision:

1. Against the will of the Party leadership, Torgler voluntarily gave himself up to the fascists.

2. The Party leadership did everything possible to support Torgler during his incarceration in prison and his appearance before the court. However, Torgler refused to carry out the instuctions given to him by the Party leadership concerning his behavior at the trial.

3. Torgler accepted as his Counsel Dr. Sack, a lawyer who is known to be a fascist. Although the Party publicly unmasked Dr. Sack as the tool of the imperial prosecutor, Torgler insisted upon having Sack as his Counsel, and defended him against all attacks levelled at him by Dimitroff.

4. Torgler capitulated disgracefully before the fascist court, and from the very beginning refused to behave as a Communist and class fighter to defend the Communist Party and the Communist cause. He limited himself to a non-political defence of his own person.

5. Torgler repeatedly disassociated himself in court from the exemplary Bolshevik struggle carried on by Comrade Dimitroff on behalf of Communism, and made it understood that he did not agree with this struggle. He aimed a blow from behind at Comrade Dimitroff during this struggle, and through his behavior in court demonstrated his solidarity with the measures adopted against Comrade Dimitroff by the fascist prosecution and bloodthirsty judges.

Torgler's behavior in this respect, which is tantamount to the betrayal of Communism and the Communist Party of Germany, is still more disgraceful in view of the heroic struggle carried on by the revolutionary workers against the fascist butchers and bloody courts, and when compared with the behavior of great revolutionary heroes such as August Lutgens, Joseph Engels, Fiete Schultz and other proletarian fighters who, with their heads on the block under the axe of the executioner, declared themselves as fighters for the revolution.

Therefore, the Party Conference unanimously resolved to expel Torgler from the Communist Party of Germany for his disgraceful behavior in court, behavior unworthy of a Communist and of a revolutionary proletarian.

The Behavior of Comrades Tanev and Popov at the Leipzig Trial

CONCERNING THE DOCUMENTS ON THEIR CASE

By V. KOLAROV

THE two documents printed below are of tremendous international interest, not only because they deal with the famous Leipzig trial and the part played therein by the accused comrades, but also because they deal with questions which are of tremendous importance for our struggle against fascism in general, and German fascism in particular.

Although late in doing so, the Bulgarian comrades, Popov and Tanev, former defendants in the Leipzig trial, subjected their behavior at the trial to criticism in a special declaration presented by them to the Central Committee of the C.P. of Bulgaria. The latter on its part, in a special decision printed in the Party organ, condemned the behavior of these comrades as "incorrect and un-Bolshevik", as against which it advanced the "exemplary Bolshevik behavior" of Comrade Dimitroff, and declared that Comrades Popov and Tanev are not in the future to occupy leading posts in the Party. This decision simultaneously sharply criticizes the harmful, sectarian position adopted by the then existing leadership of the C.P. of Bulgaria towards the Leipzig trial and towards Comrade Dimitroff in particular.

An all-round elucidation of the experiences of the Leipzig trial will help to raise the campaign in connection with the forthcoming trial of Comrade Thaelmann to still greater heights, and will give the international proletariat strength and weapons enabling it to deal German fascism a new and more crushing defeat.

Comrade Dimitroff has set an example to all Communist Parties and Communists of the Bolshevik way to carry on the struggle against fascism, which leads to the defeat of the latter. Dimitroff's tactics in the struggle against fascism, which became the basis of the new tactical orientation of the Comintern, and which is absolutely and entirely supported in the decisions of the C.C. of the C.P. of Bulgaria, stand out the more clearly when contrasted with the un-Bolshevik line of personal defense pursued at the trial of Comrades Tanev and Popov.

Comrade Dimitroff's tactics arose out of his incontrovertible faith in the strength and superiority of Communism, out of his profound conviction of the instability of the fascist government; they were calculated to bring success to the anti-fascist front and defeat to the fascist beasts. But Comrade Dimitroff realises that the fascists can be defeated only as the result of being stormed by a powerful anti-fascist front. Therefore, his whole behavior at the trial is an example of revolutionary fearlessness, wherein he laid bare step by step the criminal plots and activities of the entire fascist horde, and thus actually binds together and mobilizes the anti-fascist front.

Comrade Dimitroff did not attack fascism with loud and general

phrases; he skilfully revealed and laid bare the concrete crimes of fascism and its agents. He attacked the fascist regime and the fascist government by using concrete examples of their activities in different spheres. He masterfully laid bare the political and moral substance of all the heroes and actors in the criminal concoction cooked up by the German fascist general staff with a view to crushing the German proletariat and its revolutionary Communist vanguard, and to delivering a blow against the international revolutionary movement and the Comintern. Step by step Comrade Dimitroff unmasked the fascist spies and agents-provocateurs, false witnesses, and degenerates, mobilized by the court for the purpose of giving "evidence" against the accused. He raised the curtain, and concretely revealed the vile role played by all the agents of German fascist "justice", without sparing either the preliminary investigator, the prosecuting counsel, the high court, or the fascist lawyers. Calmly and relentlessly he settled accounts with Goering and Goebbels who, in view of the complete collapse of the whole charge, made their appearance in court to save the situation.

However, the famous duel between Comrade Dimitroff and Goering only demonstrated the disgraceful defeat of fascism to the whole world.

Dimitroff's tactics, which have now been adopted by the international anti-fascist front, compelled Hitler and Goering, who had already prepared the executioner's axe for Comrade Dimitroff's head, to place him and the Bulgarian comrades in an aeroplane and despatch them full speed to Moscow.

Comrades Tanev and Popov consider that their behavior at the trial was profoundly incorrect and un-Bolshevik, and condemn it. It is all to the good that they have engaged in self-criticism, although they are late in doing so. But in so far as they try to justify themselves, it is hardly possible to consider their self-criticism as satisfactory.

The importance of the decision of the new Central Committee of the C.P. of Bulgaria is not only that it condemns the un-Bolshevik behavior of Comrades Tanev and Popov and draws the correct organizational conclusions in relation to these comrades, but that it gives a sharp criticism, in addition, of the sectarian position adopted by the former C.C. of the C.P. of Bulgaria in the conduct of the campaign in connection with the Leipzig trial. This sectarian line, rendered the more serious by the factional blindness of the Party leadership towards tried cadres trained by Dimitroff, prevented the Party's making use of an extremely favorable occasion and of the valuable weapon for mobilizing a broad people's front against fascism in Bulgaria, which was presented by Comrade Dimitroff not only by his actions at the Leipzig trial, but also by his long revolutionary struggle at the head of the Bulgarian workers. This attitude of the Party leadership towards the tasks, which the struggle against fascism sets before the Communist Party, only increased the isolation of the Communist Party of Bulgaria from the workers and toilers, and helped to bring about the Party's defeat during the military-fascist coup d'etat of May 19, 1934.

The Bulgarian lesson is of value to all Sections of the Communist International.

Our Behavior at the Leipzig Trial

Declaration by B. POPOV and V. TANEV

IN view of the need for drawing lessons from the Leipzig Trial so as to educate our Party cadres, we make the following declaration, to *Comrades Dimitroff, Manuilsky, Piatnitsky,* and to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria.

In his first speech at the trial, Torgler declared that he would defend his Party with all his might. We considered that he, a leading worker in the Communist Party of Germany, against which the trial was directly aimed, was the one who should take upon himself the main defense of the Communist Party of Germany, and we hoped, especially after the declaration he made, he would do so. We also thought that he had made Dr. Sack his defending counsel with the consent of the Party. However, Sack's very first statements showed that the Party had nothing to do with it. Popov asked Torgler how Sack had become his counsel. Torgler smiled, shrugged his shoulders and made no reply. As the trial went on, Torgler capitulated more and more, and finished by expressing in his final speech his warm thanks to Sack for the latter's actions as defense counsel on his behalf. And he did this after Sack had made the foulest attacks on the Communist Party of Germany, the Comintern, and the Paris Defense Committee not only during the trial, but also in his concluding speech.

During the interval after Sack had made his concluding speech, Popov said to Torgler: "Do you understand that that was an attempt to draw you away from the Party and set you against it?" To which Torgler replied: "Yes, but my head is at stake," and moved away to the far side of the cell, not wishing to say any more on the subject. When we all returned in one car after the verdict had been pronounced, he declared that, "The Paris Committee only hindered our defense", to which we replied that we had been acquitted only as a result of the international campaign. Thus, Torgler adopted a negative attitude to the international campaign and voluntarily entrusted his fate to a prominent fascist lawyer, a member of the National-Socialist Party.

Taking account of the whole of Torgler's behavior at the trial, the line of defense which he adopted can only be considered as a line of capitulation, bringing disgrace upon the Communist Party of Germany.

* * *

From his very first speech, Comrade Dimitroff adopted a position of directly defending the German Communist Party, the Comintern and Communism, and immediately took up the offensive against fascism. His truly Bolshevik line, pursued with extreme courage and skill, made Comrade *Dimitroff* the central figure of the whole trial, and he was able to set the tone of the trial and determine the direction it would take.

Comrade *Dimitroff's* behavior during the whole of the trial raised the authority of the Communist International still higher, increased the influence of Communism among broad masses throughout the world, and advanced Comrade Dimitroff, an old, prominent worker of the Comintern, to the front ranks among the best leaders of the world Communist movement. In Bulgaria, in particular, where Comrade *Dimitroff* enjoyed tremendous influence, and where with Comrade Kolarov he headed the September armed uprising,* did his fight at the Leipzig trial raise the prestige of Communism to a higher level and make Comrade Dimitroff the worthy leader and pride of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the toiling masses. All the Party's forces and the Party as a whole are rallying and must rally around Comrade Dimitroff.

* * *

In view of the tremendous historic importance of the Leipzig trial as a duel on the world arena between fascism and Communism, we should have adopted the same position as Comrade Dimitroff did, and helped him as far as we could. The main thing there was the political struggle against the trial as a whole. The fight against the specific charges made against us personally should have been conducted only as a component part of the political struggle against the indictment as a whole, by passing from the defensive to the offensive. This was the position adopted by Comrade *Dimitroff*, and this is the position to be adopted by every Communist who finds himself in a similar trial, irrespective of the complicated character and difficulties of the circumstances. We did not adopt this position, *i.e.*, the one adopted by Comrade *Dimitroff*. Our position consisted in refuting the false charges and witnesses brought against us. We thought that in this way we were indirectly helping to expose the whole trial, and considered this to be the main point of our defense. We went no further than this, and limited our position to this. We considered that as we were not participating in the political struggle in Germany we should not interfere at the trial in questions concerning the German Communist Party. We even thought that to do so would mean to weaken the conviction in the minds of the broad masses of Germany and abroad that we had nothing whatever to do with the Reichstag fire.

The course of the trial and the response it met with among the masses showed that the position we adopted was absolutely incorrect. It was just the active part which Comrade *Dimitroff* played in defending the Communist Party of Germany which drew the sympathy of the broad masses to our side, and strengthened their convictions that we were innocent.

All our other mistakes arise out of the incorrect line we adopted of limiting our defense merely to refuting the false charges levelled against us. When Comrade *Dimitroff* was expelled from the court, we did nothing in protest or to show that we were solid with him. Neither did we refuse to have official counsel, as Comrade *Dimitroff* did. And what is

* September, 1923.—*Ed.*

most important we did not, in our own final speeches, make declarations expressing our solidarity with the concluding speech of Comrade *Dimitroff*. Arising out of the same incorrect position, we refrained from making an extensive criticism of the case in our final speeches, but restricted ourselves to a short declaration, considering that once the prosecutor had withdrawn the charges levelled against us, the question was closed. This maneuver was made by the prosecuting counsel for the special purpose of making us renounce our concluding speeches. Comrade *Dimitroff* did not fall into this trap, but we, unfortunately, did, for our main line of defense was wrong. Neither did we mention in court the fact that we had been flogged after being arrested, nor that Tanev had taken a wrong, non-Bolshevik step in attempting to commit suicide—nor did we use these facts as a protest against the fascist terror and the awful conditions in which we were kept during the preliminary investigation and the trial.

The position we adopted in connection with our defense arose out of our failure to understand the tremendous historic significance of the trial, and our failure to understand the part we should play at the trial.

It is clear, for all this, that the position we adopted in court in our defense was wrong and non-Bolshevik, and therefore our behavior there cannot serve as an example of how Communists should behave in a bourgeois court.

The exemplary behavior of Comrade *Dimitroff* at the Leipzig trial must serve as an example of how Communists should behave, when brought up for trial before a bourgeois court.

B. Popov.
V. Tanev.

February 25, 1935, Moscow.

Decision of the C.C. of the C.P. of Bulgaria on the Declaration of Comrades Popov and Tanev *

HAVING discussed, in the light of their statement, the behavior of Comrades Popov and Tanev at the Leipzig trial, the Central Committee declares that the behavior of these comrades at the trial was *incorrect and non-Bolshevik.* Comrades Popov and Tanev *did not understand the political significance of the trial, and adopted the line of personal vindication.* They agreed to their defense being conducted by an official fascist counsel, and even failed to refer in court to the tortures to which they had been subjected during the preliminary interrogation, adhering to the line of doing nothing "to irritate the court". They not

only failed to make a protest against the expulsion of *Georgi Dimitroff* from the court, but made it possible for the fascist court to point to their behavior as an "example" to be followed by Comrade Dimitroff. Comrades Popov and Tanev *did not act in solidarity with the line pursued by Comrade Dimitroff at the trial*, but rather hindered this line. After the prosecutor had withdrawn the charges levelled against them, they completely lost all interest in the trial, and laid the whole burden of the political struggle against fascism upon Comrade G. Dimitroff, and what is more, did not even express their solidarity in their final speeches with Comrade Dimitroff's concluding speech.

The Central Committee considers that the behavior of Popov and Tanev deserves condemnation all the more, since they were members of the Party leadership, and consequently should have served as an example. Moreover, they had the benefit of the living example of Comrade G. Dimitroff, and of a number of trials in Germany, which they did not follow.

1. In view of the above, the Central Committee resolves *to forbid Comrades Popov and Tanev to occupy leading posts in the Party*, and to give them an opportunity of proving in practice, in the work they undertake, that they recognize their mistake. The Central Committee considers it essential, in addition, to note that Comrade Tanev's attempt at suicide during the preliminary investigation by cutting his veins, constitutes a weakness impermissible in a Bolshevik. This attempt reflected a petty-bourgeois, romantic, non-Bolshevik passion for "revolutionary" gestures, which have cost the Party very many losses in the past, and against which, unfortunately, no struggle has been carried on. Such comrades forget that every Communist is Party capital which it is not easy to restore, and to make correct use of which a consistent struggle must be waged, without, of course, making any concessions to the class enemy. Comrade Tanev's mistake is further aggravated by the fact that he said nothing at the trial about this attempt at suicide, thus failing to expose the methods of the preliminary interrogation to which the accused were subjected.

2. The Central Committee contrasts the behavior of Comrades Popov and Tanev at the trial to the *exemplary, Bolshevik* behavior of Comrade *Dimitroff*. Realizing the tremendous political importance of the trial, Comrade G. Dimitroff by his heroic and skilful fight converted the court into a world tribune for the struggle against German and world fascism. From accused, Comrade *Dimitroff* became the accuser, and before the eyes of the whole world of public opinion he exposed the real incendiaries of the Reichstag, the butchers of the German people, Goering and Goebbels. Comrade Dimitroff made a brilliant defense of the Communist Party of Germany and the Comintern, and demonstrated the ideological and moral superiority of Communism against fascism. Just at the time when fascism was rejoicing at its victory in Germany, Comrade Georgi Dimitroff delivered the first heavy blow at it by unmasking it and showing it to the toilers of the whole world in its true

* Published in No. 8 of *Rabotnichesky Vestnik*, September, 1935.

colors. Comrade Dimitroff's fight at the trial roused the fighting spirit of the German proletariat, by showing them that in spite of everything it is possible to fight against fascism. The tremendous sympathy won by Dimitroff as a result of his heroic struggle served as a mighty impetus to the creation of a world-wide united anti-fascist front, which, in the long run, obtained the release of Dimitroff and his comrades. As for the Bulgarian working class movement, Comrades Dimitroff defended it in a most worthy fashion at the trial, and provided it with valuable arguments for the struggle against Bulgarian fascism. Comrade Dimitroff proved himself a worthy son and leader of the heroic working class of Bulgaria and of its vanguard, the Communist Party of Bulgaria. His skilful, brilliant defense at the Leipzig trial should be studied most carefully by all Party members and Young Communists.

3. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria considers it necessary to inform the whole of the Party that the Party leadership, as then constituted, *underestimated* the importance of the Leipzig trial. Not only did it not do everything within its power to raise to its proper heights the campaign in defense of the Leipzig prisoners, making its starting point the enormous popularity enjoyed by Dimitroff among the workers and toilers of Bulgaria, but it was not even able to utilize the tremendous political capital which the Party acquired thanks to Dimitroff's heroic struggle at the Leipzig trial. We saw the very strange situation that the campaign on behalf of the comrades on trial in Leipzig was carried on in Bulgaria on a much lower level than in a number of other countries, although it was a question of defending three members of our Party leadership. Comrade Dimitroff's struggle and his whole case was not sufficiently popularized. The Leipzig trial was regarded as an ordinary court case, and Dimitroff as one of many who take a good stand in court.

Such an appraisal of the trial and of the struggle carried on by Comrade Dimitroff is *in sharp contradiction to the appraisal given by the Comintern and the international proletariat.* It was undoubtedly a reflection of the survivals of the inner Party struggle in the past, which has caused no little harm to the Party up to the present, and which, although more than once condemned by the Comintern, still occupied quite a considerable place in the work of the former Central Committee. It is essential to make a determined break once and for all with these remnants of the inner Party struggle. The whole of the Party, like one man, must rally around the new Central Committee and Comrade Dimitroff, who has proved that he is the worthy and beloved leader of our Party.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BULGARIA.

Review of the "Daily Worker" (U.S.) for October, 1935

By R

OCTOBER was a month of many tasks for the *Daily Worker*. It was marked by the coincidence of an unusual number of events of great importance. Outstanding among these were:

a. The task of giving proper support to the firm and energetic efforts of the Central Committee of our Party in carrying through the line of the Seventh Congress of the C.I.

b. It had to rouse the masses against the fascist war on Ethiopia.

c. The pre-November 7 election period at its heaviest going, during October.

d. The very significant A. F. of L. convention occurred in the middle of the month.

e. The struggle against capitalist terror in the Mooney, Herndon, anti-Nazi and other important cases and activities.

f. The strike and unemployed struggles and numerous other activities of great importance to the interests of the American working class.

These were all great opportunities for our central organ.

The month was also marked by one other factor of importance. It constituted the chief period of the annual drive of the *Daily Worker* for funds, when the $60,000 quota was over-subscribed by the American working class, the great majority of the contributions coming in small amounts; and the campaign was carried through more easily than in previous years—all of which testifies to the increased prestige of our paper among the masses.

Its prestige was undoubtedly enhanced by the energetic campaigns that our paper conducted in its columns during October against Italian fascist aggression in Ethiopia, in defense of Angelo Herndon, in popularizing the united front, etc.

As against the many positive sides, however, it must be said that the *Daily Worker* did not utilize the period under review to full advantage. In fact, it showed a number of weaknesses and made a number of mistakes of a serious character, the outstanding of which we propose to discuss here.

SEVENTH CONGRESS DECISIONS AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

If we read the material published for the election campaign, an outstanding thing becomes immediately evident—namely, that the speeches, platform and records of the opponent candidates are not answered, and in fact, not even reported. In regard to our own direct campaign activities, the stories and articles are mainly limited to the meetings arranged

under our own auspices and by our own campaign committee. This was to a certain extent a reflection of the weakness of the campaign itself, namely, that, following the old, sectarian methods of work, our candidates did not put their main efforts in going to local unions, neighborhood organizations, etc. All the more was it the duty of the *Daily Worker* to point out, to popularize the work of these candidates who campaigned more seriously, to take the initiative in answering our opponents, and change the situation in sufficiently good time before the campaign was over.

Also, the *Daily Worker* treated the election campaign in a manner that tended to separate it from the actual struggles. Here we can learn from the campaign of Comrade Bill Gallacher, who was recently elected to Parliament in Great Britain. Gallacher conducted his campaign under the slogan of "We must take sanctions against the Fife Coal Company". And the main agitational material was even more concrete on the local economic situation, naming names, discussing the concrete question of housing and what could be done, and altogether, with beautiful simplicity, concentrating on the local immediate needs of the workers.

On the other hand, when we read the election material in the *Daily Worker*—let us say of Comrades Brodsky and Hathaway, the two leading New York candidates—we do not find the same concreteness. Unemployment, landlord and tenant relations, conditions in the neighborhood schools, the needs of the children, are all urgent questions in these territories, and the *Daily Worker* could have set the tone for the election campaign in the entire country and shown the other candidates how to defend the immediate interests of the workers, to win the elections, and yet not fail to bring forth our basic slogans for the struggle for Soviet Power.

The agitational material of the main candidates, as printed in the *Daily Worker*, did not give the impression that the candidates arose out of the needs of the masses in their constituencies. In fact, in general, during the election campaign, when the struggles around unemployment, strikes and similar economic issues should have become a stronger feature of the paper and should have been closely linked with the activities of the candidates—they were distinctly weak.

SEVENTH CONGRESS DECISIONS AND OUR RELATIONS WITH THE SOCIALIST PARTY

The same neglect that was shown in the election campaign in answering our opponents is evident in answering in a concrete manner the anti-proletarian actions of the Socialist Party, especially the Right wing of this Party.

The *New Leader*, the national spokesman of this Right wing, conducts a constant and vicious campaign against all militant, and especially Communist, workers, against the Soviet Union, and against our brother Parties that often exceeds even the Hearst press. We give below an analysis of a typical issue of the *New Leader* just prior to the month of October:

Analysis of *New Leader* contents, issue of September 14, including news, stories, articles, editorials, etc.

Entirely and directly anti-Communist	20⅓ cols.
Other items given anti-C.P. turn	2⅓ cols.
Economic struggles of workers	8½ cols.
General political items, book reviews, literary, etc.	6⅓ cols.
Reported moves on Labor Party	1 col.
War items	1 col.
Anti-fascist	1⅔ cols.
On Socialist Party organizational activity.....	4 cols.

Thus, it can be seen from the above that slightly over one-half of the total contents of the *New Leader* of the issue cited above is devoted to anti-Communist and anti-working class material. These attacks have not diminished since the issue of September 14th. In subsequent issues of the *New Leader*, whole supplements and sections were published, in addition to the regular issue of the paper, devoted entirely to articles against the militant labor movement.

Even the "Left" Socialist press—Norman Thomas' paper, the *Socialist Call*—is not above a generous sprinkling in its contents of anti-Communist, anti-Soviet agitation. Of course, there is a great difference between the openly reactionary character of the *New Leader* and the confused "Left" Socialism of the *Call*, and although we must make this difference, it is still our duty to criticize the *Call*, and clarify the issues which are raised before the workers. Yet, the *Call* is rarely criticized. And while the *Daily Worker* occasionally does reply to, and expose, the *New Leader*, this is not done systematically, and most of the published articles, arguments, invented facts, etc., are left unanswered.

If we consider the *Daily Worker* for October, the month under review, we find the following: There are a considerable number of items discussing the united front and its purpose, or addresses to S.P. members but there is very little material directly refuting the slander, the misinformation, and the attacks upon the Communists and the Soviet Union. There is only one feature article by Comrade Repard, in the issue of October 1, where he discusses the "Social-Democratic befuddlement on the sanctions questions". On this same question there is a section of an editorial in the *Daily Worker* wherein it is pointed out that the accusation by the *Socialist Call* that our position on sanctions is the same as the Old-Guard "Socialists" is false. In addition to these, there are three editorials citing the Brussels Congress of Italian anti-fascists, the French elections, and the A. F. of L. anti-Red amendment as arguments against the Right wing, and there is one editorial which appeals to the S.P. for the united front on the occasion of the National Executive Committee meeting. That is all for the entire month. And in view of the situation, clearly inadequate.

In the execution of the Seventh Congress line there arises the question of our attitude towards the "Left" Socialist leaders. In his Plenum speech printed in the *Daily Worker*, there is an eight column editorial,

at the top of the back page, headed, *Otto Bauer Points the Way to Working Class Unity.* In this editorial Otto Bauer is made the hero of the struggle for the united front, and even more striking, such organizations as the Mensheviks, who cannot but play a counter-revolutionary role because their very existence can only be aimed against the first Workers' Republic, are hailed as "progressive forces" whom the Leftward swinging workers should follow.

It is not necessary to repeat all that Comrade Kuusinen has already said elsewhere in this issue, and that Comrade Bittelman said in his speech, but we reiterate that our determined work to create a united front against fascism does not mean that we close our eyes to those acts of Socialist or other leaders which operate against the interests of wage earners or other masses of people.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated mistake. Thus, in reporting the convention of the American Federation of Labor, the *Daily Worker* correspondent, Comrade Carl Reeve, includes a mild criticism of the resolution of the officials of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union (politically of a Socialist complexion) who introduced a resolution which Comrade Reeve declares was unsatisfactory to "many rank-and-file delegates who consider this resolution as a useless and empty gesture", because it only proposes to instruct the Executive Council "to study the subject of independent labor political action, with the view of taking the initiative in the formation of such a Labor Party".

The very next day, October 16, the *Daily Worker* published an editorial in which it "corrects" Comrade Reeve's dispatch and, although declaring preference for Gorman's resolution, endorses also the I.L.G.W.U. resolution, without one word of criticism as to the shortcomings of this proposal. Certainly, it must be clear that a resolution which goes no further than to refer the Labor Party proposal to the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., a body the reactionary character of which is notorious throughout the world, and which on many political issues criticises even the Roosevelt administration from the Right, means to bury the proposal. The *Daily Worker* was justified in correcting Comrade Reeve because his dispatch may have given the impression that our attitude is that the I.L.G.W.U. resolution had no positive sides at all, yet made the mistake, on the other side, of not even giving one word of criticism of the shortcoming of that resolution. This is especially important because, in the I.L.G.W.U., there is a strong and close contact between the Left and Right elements in the union, and the Right elements are partly at least under the influence of the Right wing of the S.P. It should have been the function of the *Daily Worker* to point out to the rank and file of this very important union the limitations of the proposals of their officials.

SOME ERRORS IN CARRYING OUT OUR TRADE UNION POLICY

Our Party and our Central Committee have achieved a considerable measure of progress in relation to the trade union movement in the last two years, and also in relation to the preparations for the A. F. of

L. convention. One of the outstanding achievements was the uniting of the Socialist and Communist delegates to the A. F. of L. convention upon a common platform of action. It was necessary to consolidate this unity, to broaden it, to rally on various issues a much wider support among the delegates even from among those old leading officials of the A. F. of L. who might be willing to go along on single questions, but, at the same time, maintaining our independent role in the united front, criticising the wavering elements, and explaining to the mass of trade unionists and all workers why on every issue the position of the united front and the Communist Party is correct and thereby prevent them from being deceived into unqualified trust in old reactionaries and their "Left" maneuver.

This was not done in the *Daily Worker*. Here the policy was followed of overlooking the reactionary anti-labor speeches, policies and acts of the pro-industrial union leaders of the A. F. of L., and presenting these leaders in a favorable light before the readers of the *Daily Worker* by only playing up these few statements and acts which might be interpreted as progressive.

This was not the policy of the Central Committee of our Party. In the November 28 issue Comrade Foster writes of our relations with Lewis and the issues of industrial unionism:

> "The Communists support this struggle. Of course, the Communists have differences with many of the major principles of John L. Lewis. Lewis is now opposed to the Farmer-Labor Party movement which would further unite the workers and would strengthen the fight for industrial unions as well as for all progressive measures. Instead, Lewis still supports President Roosevelt whose party has launched a murderous strikebreaking terror in the South. In Alabama and Kentucky, Democratic Party officials have sent deputized gunmen and sheriffs to kill striking members of the United Mine Workers with machine gun bullets. The Communists point out the inconsistency of Lewis supporting such a party. Lewis speaks of fascism and Communism in the same breath. He lumps together fascism, the murderous, open violent dictatorship of the employers which suppresses all workers' demócratic rights in order to maintain a profit system, and Communism, which means democracy for all who toil and the rule of the broadest millions of toilers in the interests not of profits, but of benefiting all toilers. Certainly the Communists differ with such policies."

Comrade Browder in his report at the Plennm of our Central Committee, printed in the November 29 issue of the *Daily Worker*, declared on the issue of industrial unionism and on the Lewis group:

> "It is clear that this issue will be supported by us by all possible means. At the same time it must be said that the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group has not drawn all the conclusions from its struggle for industrial unionism. It has not yet drawn the conclusion that the struggle demands true trade union unity

on the basis of class struggle policies which is totally incompatible with Red-baiting. On the contrary, Communists and militant class-conscious workers are a necessary part of the consistent struggle for industrial unionism. And another conclusion which must be drawn by the Lewis, Howard, Hillman group if they shall consistently carry out this fight, is that the tremendous task of organizing the unorganized demands the restoring of trade union democracy in their own unions as well as its establishment in the new unions that are brought into being. It is clear that with the United Mine Workers, the textile workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and others in this group, these will be able to accomplish their task of being a driving force in the organization of the unorganized not only in their unions but in others, only if their own unions are made stronger, and this cannot be done without trade union democracy. . . .

"We most assuredly will not agree with their [Lewis, Howard, Hillman, etc.] methods in their own labor unions, but, on the contrary, will fight against those methods which are directed against the interests of the workers in the trade unions."

But this policy as stated by Comrades Foster and Browder was not carried out by the *Daily Worker*.

In an eight column editorial headline, it declared "Lewis Resolutions Strike Blow at Class Collaboration", and the editorial itself hailed Lewis' speech as "a great day for all those who want to see a powerful militant trade union movement in this country. . . . Every progressive, every honest trade unionist who wants to see an independent labor movement, free of the corrupting influence of the employers, will rally behind the Lewis resolutions. . . . The voice of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, must have sounded like the crack of doom in the ears of Matthew Woll and the extreme reactionary wing in the A. F. of L. Executive Council."

In this editorial, the role of the united front of the S.P. and the C.P. was not even mentioned, nor criticism made of Lewis' anti-Communist speeches and actions; and no refutation given the workers of his other reactionary speeches and acts. To have put in this criticism would not have deducted from the positive sides of Lewis' actions but would have strengthened the fight.

An editorial the next day, October 18, was given the title: "A New Era Opens in the A. F. of L." In this editorial the following is stated of the very modest steps forward that were taken: "President John L. Lewis of the U.M.W.A. and President Charles Howard of the International Typographical Union in particular, threw down the gauntlet against this policy [of opposing industrial unionism]. Their [Lewis' and Howard's] stand for industrial unionism marks a new era in the history of the A. F. of L."

The fight for industrial unionism was an important one, and was a step forward. The slogan of industrial unionism had been popularized

by the Left wing, particularly the C.P., over many years of struggle in the trade union movement, and we are in that fight now with all who join it.

In the last analysis the fight for industrial unions will rest upon the work of a real united front. Socialists and Communists must maintain their independence within the general movement for industrial unionism, in the course of which we make clear to the workers that in building industrial unions we must also abolish appointive power by the officials, establish and increase trade union democracy, make for rank and file control—things on which all leaders must take a stand. We can and do join with every resource the fight against Green, Woll, Hutchinson and the craft union policy; but we must also have positive demands to steer the movement into the most effective pro-working class channels. For instance, in regards to the Lewis Committee we demand that it be broadened to include wider representation, to endorse the Maritime Federation of the Pacific as a step to industrial unionism, etc., to add the President of the Federation to the Committee of Presidents, etc.

That we can give no unqualified endorsement to Lewis on any score was evident at the end of the A. F. of L. convention when he boldly appeared before the assembly of delegates and nominated the old reactionary clique back into office.

Hardly was the convention over, when Lewis headed a delegation to the President of the United States to protest the import of Soviet coal; and in the district meetings of his union he had his henchmen take the lead in the fight against the Labor Party, rank and file control and other similar actions.

In another editorial, published in the October 22 issue of the *Daily Worker*, unfortunately only *after the convention had closed*, we have the first effort at a declaration of the independent role of the united front of Communists and Socialists, as distinct from Lewis-Howard and Co. But even here, the following passage occurred: "The battle waged by the Lewis-Howard group for industrial unionism, by the Gorman-Nagler group for the Labor Party, and by the federal local delegates on all progressive issues, particularly trade union democracy, furnished the material for a fight to defeat reaction in the A. F. of L." How wrong it is to make such a division of tasks can be especially understood when one remembers that this editorial was written *after* the convention closed, and *after* Lewis had nominated and led the fight to put Green, Woll and Co., back into office.

Four days later, on October 26, the *Daily Worker* devoted two solid pages to excerpts from the speeches of various delegates to the convention, in which were featured, Lewis, Hillman, etc., and here again, the mistake is made that only those parts of the speeches which put these leaders in a favorable light before the workers are reprinted, and, as elsewhere in connection with this convention, there is not one word of criticism of them in the *Daily*.

We again emphasize what Comrade Kuusinen, speaking for the Communist International, said when he declared it is necessary now

to differentiate between Green, Woll and Co., and Lewis, Howard, Hillman and Co., but not to give up justified criticism.

CONCLUSION

It must be stated that the examples given from the *Daily Worker* are departures from the line of policy, and do not characterize the activities of our Central Committee, the Party as a whole or even most of the work of the *Daily Worker*. The Central Committee must, however, take measures to strengthen the carrying out of the Seventh Congress line in the *Daily Worker*. We must not allow the development in the minds of our comrades of any idea that we are for a united front "at any cost". We are for the defense of the interests of the working class at any cost. But not to bring before the workers our criticism of those anti-labor acts of the reactionary officials or Right Socialist, or even "Left" Socialists (where no agreement exists providing other machinery), is not to serve the interests of the working class or the defeat of fascism, or the united front.

Similarly, our comrades are not helping the united front when they allow themselves to be carried away by the pro-industrial union statements of Lewis, Howard, Hillman and Co. (whose ultimate objects are in fact still uncertain). If our comrades see one ounce of words from Bauer which might be interpreted as favorable to the united front, does that mean that they must disregard his other writings, for example his review praising Souvarine's contemptible book. In this book Souvarine vilifies the Soviet Union and Comrade Stalin, publishes the most contemptible stool-pigeon agitation against the Communist International, supplying the fascists with material to be used in the Thaelmann trial about Communist "terror", etc.? As we have already said, it would be sectarian and pedantic stupidity to repeat on every indiscriminate occasion the past misdeeds of such people as Bauer, Lewis, Howard, etc.; but we should not be silent as to their present misdeeds (Lewis' likening Communism to Nazism, Bauer's attack on the U.S.S.R., and such similar acts).

We would urge the Central Committee of our Party, which is firmly, energetically and boldly carrying out the line of the Seventh Congress, to intensify the educational work among the Party members and functionaries and, in this connection, we urge the writers for the *Daily Worker* to read again, and in the light of self-criticism to study more thoroughly, the Seventh Congress documents.

England, Italy, Ethiopia

By RICHARD

OF all the literature especially devoted to the question of the Italo-Ethiopian war, a book which deserves attention is that written by Major-General Henry Rowan-Robinson of the British High Command, entitled *England, Italy, Abyssinia*,* which appeared last September in London.

Describing the British military campaign in Ethiopia under Sir Rober Napier in 1867-68, Rowan-Robinson dwells in particular upon two circumstances which furthered the favorable outcome of the campaign for the British. This was the organization of supplies to the army which was landed at Mulkutto on the shores of the Red Sea, and which was moving towards Magdala. For this purpose the British High Command had to organize a special supply service, and so on April 1, 1868, while the army consisted of 10,800 men, the transport and supply service accounted for another 14,400 men. This shows "the need for preparations, especially as regards supplies and transport, which are sufficiently important in any campaign and in mountain war are often a decisive factor", says Rowan-Robinson. This also shows, continues the author, "the attention that must be paid to the organization of lines of communication and the large number of units required to occupy these lines".

On the other hand, the British High Command won to its side various Ethiopian tribes (for instance the Galla Wollo) and was thus able to weaken the enemy considerably.

In Rowan-Robinson's opinion these points were not sufficiently borne in mind by the Italian command in 1896. The defeat of the Italian army on March 1, 1896, at Adowa was due to the fact that the army advanced too far from its bases and did not ensure regular supplies to its army or secure its communications between the various units during the fighting itself, and also to the fact that "their chief Abyssinian allies—the Sebath race and Agos Tafari race . . . went over to the enemy". As a result of all this, although the Italian army numbered 20,000 fighters, it was complete routed by the Ethiopian army.

Analyzing the present war situation, the author gives data concerning the tremendous amount of preparatory work carried out by Italy for the purpose of conducting the war in Ethiopia. For the construction of roads alone, Mussolini sent over 30,000 workers into East Africa before the war began, who built roads both in the North and the South. Simultaneously with the dispatch of troops, Italy accumulated sufficient supplies of munitions and food.

However, in spite of this and of the obvious advantage of the Italian armaments, General Rowan-Robinson does not foresee any early

* *England, Italy, Abyssinia*, by Major-General R. Rowan-Robinson. Published by William Glows and Sons, Ltd., London, 1935. 148 pp.

successes for the Italian troops. The advance of the Italian troops will be hindered not only by the resistance of the Ethiopians, but also by the need to build roads in order to secure the communication lines with the rear and to create conditions suitable for the operations of mechanized troops.

> "The Italians have had no recent experiences of mountain warfare against semi-civilized or barbarous races. . . . They probably do not realize that modern weapons instead of giving the regular domination over the irregular . . . have actually strengthened mountaineers equipped with a modern rifle against organized armies." (Page 128.)

If it is true that in open battles the Italian army, in view of its technical equipment, may have the advantage over the Ethiopian troops, in guerilla warfare, to which the Ethiopians will no doubt resort, the latter, in their own native mountains, will be able to offer strong resistance to an even bigger army.

Rowan-Robinson upholds these assertions by citing a number of historical examples of colonial warfare.

He writes:

> "In July 1933, during the operations on the Beddou Mountain (13,000 feet) in the Atlas, 7,000 Berbers were opposed to 35,000 French (or French-trained) troops, furnished with the most modern equipment. . . . Direct attacks with the powerful support of airplanes and artillery completely failed." (Page 128.)

Neither does Rowan-Robinson expect any big successes for the Italians even if individual leaders of Ethiopian tribes join the Italian side. In spite of the fact that individual feudal lords are not anxious to subordinate themselves to the orders of the Negus, they will "unite around their own leader in case the war will in future be in the nature of national defense". And the war will without doubt be of this kind, is the conclusion of the author.

According to Rowan-Robinson, the outcome of the war depends on an extremely large number of "ifs".

> "If Abyssinian leaders can restrain their men and inculcate guerilla tactics, a long and desperately contested war may ensue. If Italy employs the bulk of her air force for air supply, she may effect a quick contest. Otherwise, if she is to avoid disaster, she must move by slow stages especially in the mountains, and ultimate victory will then depend on the endurance of the Italian pulse and of Mussolini's prestige." (Pages 138-39.)

If the opinions expressed by the author on the tactical and strategical questions of the war in Ethiopia reflects the minds of a military specialist, in his views on the relations between Britain, Italy and Ethiopia, however, one can sense in every word an ardent defender of British imperialism.

In considering Italy's arguments in defense of her aggression in Ethiopia, the author comes to the conclusion that none of these bear criticism at all.

> "Mussolini's proposed action goes back to the days of barbarism." (Page 23.)

Mussolini's arguments amount to the old claim of the "Have-nots" against the "Haves".

Mussolini's statement to the effect that he is following in the footsteps of those great Englishmen who created the British Empire cause the learned gentleman to use strong language. The General most unwillingly half admits that "other powers" have sometimes behaved as cynically, but, firstly, these cases have been rare, and secondly . . . there were usually strong arguments in defense of their actions, which were recognized by world public opinion. (A few pages further on the author gives an example of these "universally recognized arguments": the seizure of Manchuria by Japan, which Rowan-Robinson considers was quite justified.) The Italian arguments, however, amount to putting forward "poverty as a justification for armed robbery".

On the other hand, the author grants that Italy has a right to "equality of opportunity". He considers that Ethiopia would be committing the same serious crime in the sphere of economics, as Italy is preparing to commit in the military and political sphere, if she refuses to allow foreigners to develop her natural wealth while not in a position to exploit them herself.

In other words, while admitting that Italy has the right to "equality of opportunity" in Ethiopia, Great Britain will not allow the arbitrary seizure of it by Italy. This "equality of opportunity" must apparently be realized on the basis of the Triple Agreement (Great Britain, France, Italy) of 1906, which, incidentally Rowan-Robinson quotes as follows:

> "The interests of Great Britain and Egypt in the Nile Basin. . . . The interests of Italy in Eritrea and Somalia, more especially with reference to the hinterland of her possessions and the territorial connection between them to the west of Addis Abbaba. . . . The interests of France in Ethiopia, particularly as regards the railway, from Djibuti to Addis Abbaba." (Page 89.)

Why is Great Britain trying to save Ethiopia from the brutal violence of Italy? There are three reasons for this. The first reason, says the author, is both moral and material, namely—our care for peace. The second reason is interest in the fate of the League of Nations and Great Britain's obligations to the League. The third is the desire not to arouse "our" colored races and an equal desire to unite the white and colored races of the world into one camp.

All the reasons, as one can see, are very "noble" ones. There are no "low" commercial interests therein, as the author himself declares. The author does everything to support the old story about Great Britain

having gone into the world war in defense of the poor little Belgium.

But a few pages further on the author himself helps to dispel the myth of Great Britain's role as "defender of the weak", when he comes to questions concerning the concrete policy of Great Britain in relation to the Italian-Ethiopian war. He himself shows that Great Britain is defending her own imperialist interests.

The author does not believe that the League of Nations would be able to restrain Mussolini, chiefly because of the European policy of France.

> "If Mussolini is allowed to trounce the Abyssinians . . . the League will be condemned by the weaker states and also by the colored races." (Page 103.)

—and then a crisis will come in the League of Nations.

General Rowan-Robinson is much more frank about the attitude of the British imperialists to the League of Nations than were Baldwin and Hoare, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, before the dissolution of Parliament.

Robinson talks about Great Britain supporting collective measures of security so long as they serve her interests. But as soon as this ceases to be, then other safety measures must be resorted to. Rowan-Robinson considers one of these measures to be the creation of a new League of Nations.

> ". . . with all those finer elements of the old that lead to goodwill among the peoples and the betterment of mankind." (Page 110.)

This statement made by Rowan-Robinson about the reorganization of the League reflects the maneuvers and the search after new methods now being carried through by British imperialism. They reflect the desire of British imperialism to arrive at an agreement with German fascism and then effect a compromise with France so as to safeguard British interests in Africa and in the Mediterranean, and to assure the maintenance of peace for a few years in Western Europe at the price of military adventures in the East. Hence all the talk about new leagues of nations, hence the statements like that of Baldwin in Parliament about the British government being prepared to act in this direction in order to maintain "some form of collective security".

New FEBRUARY Books

On the INTERNATIONAL List

Rulers of America

A Study of Finance Capital

By ANNA ROCHESTER

"This is the most penetrating analysis of the composition of the financial groups that rule America that has yet appeared . . . Miss Rochester allows us to peer behind the scenes to observe the power exercised by the financial monarchs of our day. After monumental research, she has brought together an elaborate tabulation of the financial groups, their interconnections and the companies they dominate or influence. We are allowed, almost for the first time, to glimpse the full extent of the vast empires they have constructed. . . .

"But the present work is not alone a study of the emergence of financial empires or of financial leaders. It is a description of the trends which brought American capitalism into its present pattern, together with a statement of probable future development."

—*Colston E. Warne, Professor of Economics, Amherst College.*

Book Union Selection for February - - $2.75

THE SOVIET UNION

A Symposium by Soviet Leaders

Comprehensive picture of the Soviet Union in every sphere of activity during the past few years. Articles on: Machinery and Men; The Soviet Government; Soviet Democracy; Economic Progress; Heavy Industry; Agriculture; Financial Program; Foreign Trade; National Defense; Moscow Subway.

$1.25

THIS FINAL CRISIS

By ALLEN HUTT

Economic and political survey of the major turning points in social development during the last hundred years. Describes how social crises in the past were solved within the framework of capitalism and indicates how such a solution is no longer possible today.

$2.00

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City

Required Reading on China and Japan

from the INTERNATIONAL List

WHEN JAPAN GOES TO WAR

By O. TANIN *and* E. YOHAN

An analysis of Japan's fighting resources; her provocations against the U.S.S.R.; the foreign policy which inspires the anti-Soviet attack; its inevitable transformation into a world-wide conflict which will disturb the *status quo* in Europe and challenge the sea power of the United States and the British Empire.

Ready March 18—$1.75

By the Same Authors:

Militarism and Fascism in Japan

A study of the military-fascist movements in relation to foreign policy $1.75

•

China's Red Army Marches

By AGNES SMEDLEY

Vivid reportage of the Chinese Soviets 1.60

Fundamental Laws of the Chinese Soviet Republic
Introduction by Bela Kun ..... $ .25

Red China
By President Mao Tse-tung ..... .05

Tales of Modern China
By Oscar Erdberg ..... .25

Japan's Drive for Conquest
By Grace Hutchins ..... .05

Order from your nearest bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D New York City